

and Ellen M. Anthony, of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of Mrs. C. O. Baltzell, of Princeton, chairman of the First District Woman's Franchise League; Francis C. Hankins and Dr. Mary E. Phelps, of the Evansville Branch, Woman's Franchise League; and Luella C. Embree, of the Woman's Franchise League of Princeton, all in Indiana, in favor of the Bristow-Mondell resolution proposing Federal constitutional amendment providing that right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Division No. 154, Charles Setter, secretary, favoring the Cummins-Goeke boiler-inspection bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Bureau of Animal Industry employees, indorsing the Lobeck-Lewis bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. F. Kreymsborg, favoring the Bristow-Mondell resolution for woman suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SLOAN: Petition of sundry business men of Polk, Hordville, and Stromsburg, Nebr., favoring House bill 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 29, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou dost fill our lives with precious memories. We have come out of the joyous season of the Christmas time, out of the holiest day in our Christian calendar, with the memories of home associations, the friendships, with the hopes created in us by the Christian faith, with the blessed ministry of a Christian civilization about us. We have come out of this holy season to address ourselves once more to the tasks of life. We remember the ideal life whose coming to the world we have commemorated, the standard of all greatness, the touchstone of all truth, the guide unto all the blessed destiny beyond us. Grant us the Christ spirit in all we undertake for our fellow men and for our country. Guide us unto great success and prosperity in our national life. We ask it for the sake of Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

NATHAN GOFF, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, appeared in his seat to-day.

### NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., December 29, 1914.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CLAUDE AUGUSTUS SWANSON, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES P. CLARKE,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. SWANSON thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer and directed that the Journal of the last legislative day be read.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 23, 1914, was read and approved.

### LEGATION BUILDING, HABANA, CUBA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of State, addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that the Secretary of the Treasury transmit to the House of Representatives an item for the acquisition of legation premises at Habana, Cuba, amounting to \$100,000.

This request has my hearty approval, and I venture to urge this appropriation upon the Congress with great earnestness. I think that the whole country now sees how desirable it is that we should be upon the same footing of advantage in foreign capitals that other Governments are. This purchase is recommended in the spirit of the recent policy sanctioned by

Congress in these matters, and I sincerely hope that we may not miss this unusual opportunity in the city of Habana.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 22, 1914.

[Letter and inclosure accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.]

### RATES FOR OCEAN TRANSPORTATION (S. DOC. NO. 673).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 18th instant, a preliminary report relative to the increased rates for ocean transportation since July 1, 1914, together with certain facts which adversely affect or injure American commerce, and so forth.

Mr. FLETCHER. The communication is in response to a resolution submitted by me, and I ask that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

### POWELL SCHOOL (S. DOC. NO. 674).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the acting president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for buildings and grounds, public buildings, District of Columbia, for an eight-room addition to the Powell School, \$66,000, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### STREETS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 675).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting an estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for increasing the width of roadway of Fourteenth Street NW., between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, to 70 feet, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

### REPORT OF COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the year ended October 31, 1914, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

### CREDENTIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH, Jr., chosen by the electors of the State of New York a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915. The credentials are duly certified by the governor of the State. The Secretary will read the credentials in full, and if there be no objection, they will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The credentials were read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. PERKINS presented the credentials of JAMES D. PHELAN, chosen by the electors of the State of California a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer as Acting President pro tempore:

S. 6227. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Norfolk-Berkley Bridge Corporation, of Virginia, to construct a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River in Virginia;

S. 6687. An act to authorize the Chesapeake & Ohio Northern Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Ohio River a short distance above the mouth of the Little Scioto River, between Scioto County, Ohio, and Greenup County, Ky., at or near Sciotoville, Ohio; and

H. R. 6039. An act to reimburse Edward B. Kelley for moneys expended while superintendent of the Rosebud Indian Agency in South Dakota.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER presented resolutions of the Municipal Council of Bolinao, Province of Pangasinan, Phil-

ippine Islands, favoring the passage of the so-called Jones bill, for the self-government of the Philippine people, which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have a telegram from the Brunswick (Ga.) Board of Trade. It is short, and I would be glad to have it read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BRUNSWICK, GA., December 26, 1914.

Senator HOKE SMITH,  
Washington, D. C.:

This organization protests emphatically the action of the English Government in declaring naval stores and resinous products absolutely contraband of war. The South has suffered the loss of untold millions through the effects of the European war on her three great sources of wealth—cotton, lumber, and naval stores. If this action of Great Britain is allowed to stand, the naval-stores industry will be brought to a standstill and its recovery will require many years. No American industry has suffered such serious reverses as have been endured by the naval-stores industry during the past 18 months, and Great Britain's action may well be the blow that will kill this rich source of revenue and profit to the South. We urge you to use every means in your power to have the United States Government take a firm stand against this action of Great Britain.

THE BRUNSWICK BOARD OF TRADE.

Mr. HITCHCOCK presented a petition of sundry citizens of Long Island and Brooklyn, in the State of New York, praying for the prohibition of the exportation of contraband of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Texas, praying for the prohibition of exportation of contraband of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THORNTON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minden, La., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of rural-credit legislation and referendum on war declarations, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a petition of Bert J. Clark Camp, No. 12, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Oregon, of McMinnville, Oreg., praying for the enactment of national-defense legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the memorial of Adolph Wagner, of Concord, N. H., remonstrating against the exportation of arms and ammunition to Europe, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented a petition of sundry citizens of Laramie County, Wyo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Goodland, Fort Scott, and Osawatomie, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation for the further inspection of locomotive boilers, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Winfield and Ness City, in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wellington, Kans., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Divide, Colo., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Topeka, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA presented petitions of sundry citizens of North Dakota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit exportation of contraband of war, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of North Dakota, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHIELDS presented petitions of the Lookout Mountain Christian Endeavor Society, of Chattanooga; of the Baptist Sunday School of Cumberland Gap; of the First Cumberland

Presbyterian Sunday School of Chattanooga; of the quarterly conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Fayetteville; of the Baptist Tabernacle Sunday School, of Chattanooga; of the Whiteside Street Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Chattanooga; of the St. James Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, of Chattanooga; of sundry citizens of Winchester, Madisonville, Soddy, Big Sandy, New Market, Copperhill, Kingston, Maryville, Sale Creek, Howell, Westport, Decherd, Livingston, and Briceville; of the congregations of the Nazarene Church, of Erin; the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Knoxville, the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Kenton; the Presbyterian Church of Benton; the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Franklin; the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Savannah; and the New Providence Presbyterian Church, of Maryville, all in the State of Tennessee, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BURTON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prevent the exportation of munitions of war to belligerent nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the circulation of anti-Catholic publications through the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Michigan, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the circulation of anti-Catholic publications through the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit export of contraband of war, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Michigan, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Waterbury, Conn., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mails, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented memorials of sundry Hebrew organizations of New Haven, and of Norwich Camp, No. 75, Order Sons of Zion, of Norwich, in the State of Connecticut, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday School of Noank; of Nordstjernon Lodge, No. 48, International Order of Good Templars, of Bridgeport; of sundry citizens of Bridgeport; and of members of Chapter 1216, Methodist Brotherhood, of New London, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have received two telegrams, one from Bay St. Louis, Miss., and the other from Pascagoula, Miss., which I ask may be received and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAY ST. LOUIS, MISS., December 28, 1914.

Hon. JAMES K. VARDAMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Announced intention of English Government declaring turpentine and rosin absolute contraband of war will prove seriously detrimental to the turpentine industry. Will you not invoke the influence of the State Department against such action on part of foreign Governments?

IMPERIAL NAVAL STORES CO.  
HANCOCK NAVAL STORES CO. (LTD.).  
JORDAN RIVER TURPENTINE CO.  
HANCOCK COUNTY BANK.  
MERCHANTS' BANK.  
W. J. GEX.

PASCAGOULA, MISS., December 28, 1914.

Hon. JAMES K. VARDAMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

I observe that the English Government proposes to declare rosin and turpentine absolute contraband of war. Such action would be disastrous to a great industry, in which a large number of people in this immediate section are interested. Will you not use your influence with the Secretary of State against the proposed English action?

J. I. FORD.

Mr. PITTMAN. I have a telegram from I. Wood, of Reno, Nev., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO, NEV., December 21, 1914.

Hon. KEY PITTMAN, Washington, D. C.:

The Business Men's Association of Washoe County, Nev., at a regular meeting, has instructed me as secretary to telegraph all Nevada Representatives to oppose national prohibition.

I. WOOD.



Mr. KERN presented a petition of the State legislative board of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers of Indiana, praying for the enactment of further boiler-inspection legislation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Logansport, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit exportation of contraband of war, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Owen County, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide a volunteer officers' retirement list, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of the Iron Molders' Local Union, of Musicians' Local Union No. 25, of Teamsters' Local Union No. 144, of Coopers' Local Union No. 66, of Tailors' International Union, and of Stationary Firemen's Local Union, all of Terre Haute, in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Spokane, Wash., praying for the creation of a national security commission, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Emma L. Parks, president, Mrs. D. J. Orner, vice president, and other officers and members of the University Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Seattle, Wash., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS presented petitions of the National Pacific Oil Co., of Coalinga, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the leasing of the public lands, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a memorial of the passenger steamboat lines of the Great Lakes, remonstrating against the so-called La Follette seamen's bill unless passenger and excursion steamers on the Great Lakes are exempted, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Council of Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation looking to the betterment of the condition of employees in the Canal Zone, which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

He also presented petitions of sundry fraternal organizations of Los Gatos, San Jose, Creston, and Oakland, and of the Chambers of Commerce of Truckee, Quincy, Grass Valley, and Decoto, all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which were referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. BURLEIGH presented a memorial of the Congregation Beth Israel, of Bangor, Me., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide a literacy test for immigrants to this country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of a literacy test for immigrants to this country, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of George W. Freerks and 120 other citizens of Ortonville, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of contraband of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ROOT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Montezuma, N. Y., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION AND RURAL CREDIT.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to which was referred Senate resolution 507, submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read. The resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 214, part 1, Sixty-third Congress, first session, entitled "Agricultural Cooperation and Rural Credit in Europe," for the use of the Senate document room.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. My attention was diverted. To what document does it refer?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is the resolution in reference to Senate Document 214. The committee approved it this morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection.

Mr. JONES. I wish to ask how the document will be distributed when printed. Will it be allotted to the different Senators pro rata?

Mr. FLETCHER. They will go to the document room.

Mr. JONES. Then those who get there first will get the document. I shall object to the present consideration of the resolution. I have a great many requests for the document. I think the copies ought to be allotted to different Senators, so that we can at least take care of our constituents as far as the printing is provided for.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say to the Senator from Washington there is no particular objection to that except that probably some Senators will not care for them particularly and there are others who will want more than their allotment. If the Senator will let me know how many he needs, I shall be very glad to see that he gets them.

Mr. JONES. If there are Senators who do not want them, they can very easily transfer their allotment to Senators who desire them. I have had 25 or 30 requests already, which I have not been able to supply. I am getting requests for it almost every day. It is quite a large document and quite an important one. I think it should be distributed pro rata among Senators, and those who do not need it can very easily transfer their allotment to those who do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I suggest to the Senator from Washington to let the resolution be considered at this time, when it will be open to amendment, and then we can provide for a pro rata distribution. I think his suggestion is a very good one.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection if the Senate desires to have the resolution amended so that they will go to the folding room instead of to the document room.

Mr. JONES. With that amendment I will have no objection to the resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let the resolution be considered and amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington object to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. JONES. I do not, with the understanding that the chairman of the committee will have no objection to having the resolution amended so that the documents will go to the folding room instead of to the document room.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JONES. I offer the amendment I suggested.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the documents go to the folding room, does not the law require that they shall be distributed not only to Senators but also be sent to libraries all over the country, and have they not already been distributed in that way?

Mr. FLETCHER. A distribution of that kind has already been made, so that none of these copies will be sent to the libraries.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. They are simply to be distributed to Senators?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; to Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Strike out the words "document room" from the end of the resolution, so as to read "for the use of the Senate."

Mr. JONES. That carries the document to the folding room?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

#### REPORT ON RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Printing I report back favorably with an amendment Senate resolution 508, providing for printing additional copies of Senate Document 380, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 10,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 380, parts 1, 2, and 3, Sixty-third Congress, second session, entitled "Agricultural Credit—Land-Mortgage or Long-Term Credit," for the use of the Senate document room.

The amendment of the committee was, before the word "thousand," to strike out "10" and insert "5."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. I think the resolution should be amended the same as the other resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. Strike out from the end of the resolution the words "document room."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 7061) granting an increase of pension to Allen P. Gilson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 7062) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Lyle Mahan; and

A bill (S. 7063) granting an increase of pension to Caro G. Moore (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 7064) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Ashland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 7065) for the appointment of William Sooy Smith, late a brigadier general of United States Volunteers, to the rank of brigadier general on the retired list of the United States Army; and

A bill (S. 7066) for the relief of Amos Dahuff (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 7067) providing for appeals in bankruptcy matters, and repealing sections 24 and 25 of "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STERLING:

A bill (S. 7068) granting a pension to Bernard Christianson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 7069) to provide for a nominating election for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 7070) granting an increase of pension to George E. Harris (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 7071) to provide for the disposition of the public lands for the supply of water for irrigation and the generation of power; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 7072) granting an increase of pension to La Fayette Piatt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for Mr. STONE):

A bill (S. 7073) granting an increase of pension to James Enloe;

A bill (S. 7074) granting an increase of pension to John Stone;

A bill (S. 7075) granting an increase of pension to Rachel W. Carney (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7076) granting an increase of pension to Allie McGloughlin (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7077) granting an increase of pension to William A. Reames (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 7078) to repeal an act entitled "An act granting to the city of Twin Falls, Idaho, certain lands for reservoir purposes," approved June 7, 1912, and to revoke the grant made thereby; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 7079) granting an increase of pension to Delilah Lobenthal; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7080) granting an increase of pension to Asa Gatton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7081) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Conley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7082) granting an increase of pension to Henry Harpham (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7083) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS:

A bill (S. 7084) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 7085) granting a pension to Michael Lacey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7086) granting an increase of pension to William W. Waters (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 7087) granting an increase of pension to James Hammond; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7088) granting a pension to Ada Tenney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 7089) granting an increase of pension to Henry Walker (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 7090) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to patent certain lands to the State of Utah and to accept relinquishment from the State of Utah of certain other lands in lieu thereof; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HUGHES:

A bill (S. 7091) to create an additional judge in the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$130,000 for the purchase of a site and the construction and equipment of a building or buildings for a municipal lodging house and wood and stone yard in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19422), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCUMBER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$88,850 for the support and education of 250 Indian pupils at the Indian school at Wahpeton, N. Dak., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian Appropriation bill (H. R. 20150), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the employees of the Senate and House of Representatives, including secretaries to Members of Congress, who, by reason of the duties assigned to them, may be required to return to their respective places of appointment, mileage at the rate of 5 cents a mile each way, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the employees of the Senate, who, by reason of the duties assigned to them, may be required to return to their respective places of appointment, mileage at the rate of 5 cents per mile each way, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the support and education of Indian pupils at the Indian school at Bismarck, N. Dak., from \$20,000 to \$45,000, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill (H. R. 20150), which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,200 for the salary of a chief clerk at the assay office, Salt Lake City, Utah, and also to increase the appropriation for wages of workmen and other employees at the assay office, Salt Lake City, Utah, from \$1,500 to \$2,000, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MYERS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 for the improvement of the Federal building at Billings, Mont., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JONES submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$6,000 for the appointment of temporary statistical clerks and stenographers under the Bureau of Labor Statistics, District of Columbia, to be selected from the civil service register and to be paid at the rate of not exceeding \$100 per month, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill (H. R. 19909), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for constructing and equipping a lighthouse tender for general service, Department of Commerce, Bureau of Lighthouses, from \$250,000 to \$325,000, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 20241), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.



Mr. LEE of Maryland submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$9,600 for the purchase of 12 small automobiles for the use of the police department in the regulation of traffic, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19422), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that in the expenditure of appropriations for public schools in the District of Columbia there shall be no discriminating charge made against pupils from any State or Territory of the United States, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill (H. R. 19422), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8846), which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. LEWIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—JAMES GARNETT.

On motion of Mr. WORKS, it was

*Ordered*, That the papers in the case of James Garnett (S. 1652, 63d Cong., 1st sess.) be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, no adverse report having been made thereon.

#### ADDITIONAL MINORITY EMPLOYEE.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a few days ago, on behalf of the minority, I submitted a resolution providing for an additional employee in the folding room of the Senate. The resolution was agreed to; but I find that even if provision is made for such an employee, as I think there will be in a pending appropriation bill, there will be no payment of his salary until the beginning of the next fiscal year. I therefore submit the following resolution, which I send to the desk and ask that it be read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 510) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved*, That an additional employee, in behalf of the minority, be appointed for service in the folding room of the Senate at a salary of \$1,000 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

#### COPPER SHIPMENTS TO NEUTRAL COUNTRIES.

Mr. WALSH. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask that it may be read and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 511) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to cause to be transmitted to the Senate copies of all communications transmitted to or received from representatives of foreign Governments touching the seizure or detention by any belligerent nation of shipments of copper from the ports of the United States consigned to neutral countries of Europe.

Copies of any communications so transmitted or received touching the proclamations of certain of the belligerents declaring copper to be either conditional or absolute contraband.

Copies of any such communications touching the declaration made in proclamations of certain of the belligerents to the effect that articles scheduled by them as conditional contraband shall be liable to capture on board a vessel bound for a neutral port, if the goods are consigned to order, and the further declaration therein that such goods shall be subject to confiscation unless the owners prove an innocent destination.

And copies of any communications touching the following recital of the so-called Declaration of London Order in Council, No. 2, 1914, to wit:

"2. Where it is shown to the satisfaction of one of His Majesty's principal secretaries of state that the enemy Government is drawing supplies for its armed forces from or through a neutral country, he may direct that, in respect of ships bound for a port in that country, article 35 of the said declaration shall not apply. Such direction shall be notified in the London Gazette and shall operate until the same is withdrawn. So long as such direction is in force a vessel which is carrying conditional contraband to a port in that country shall not be immune from capture."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Thursday morning next, immediately before the conclusion of the morning business, I shall address the Senate on the subject matter contained in the resolution.

#### NATION-WIDE PROHIBITION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I wish to say that in naming the delegates from Southern States to the Constitu-

tional Convention of 1787 in my address of Friday, December 18, I gave only those who signed the Constitution after its completion. I intended also to give the names of others who participated in the convention from these States, but neglected to do so. They were Edmund Randolph, George Mason, George Wythe, and James McClurg, from Virginia; Alexander Martin and William Richardson Davie, from North Carolina; William Pierce and William Houstoun, from Georgia; John Francis Mercer and Luther Martin, from Maryland. Of these delegates John Francis Mercer and Luther Martin, of Maryland; George Wythe and James McClurg, of Virginia; Alexander Martin and William Richardson Davie, of North Carolina; William Pierce and William Houstoun, of Georgia, were not present on the last day of the convention and failed to sign. Edmund Randolph and George Mason, of Virginia, were the only ones present on the last day who refused to sign. The name Jacob "Brown," as it appears in the RECORD, should be Jacob Broom; that of "Hu" Williamson should be Hugh Williamson.

I intended also to refer in that address to the tenth amendment to the Constitution, and to say that, like the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions, it was aimed at the assumption of undelegated powers by the General Government and contradicted in no sense the right of the peoples of the States to grant further powers through the regular process of amendment. In support of this statement I wish to cite an excerpt from the Supreme Court of the United States in Kansas against Colorado, Two hundred and sixth United States, page 46, in which the opinion of the court was delivered by Mr. Justice Brewer. The excerpt is as follows:

But the proposition that there are legislative powers affecting the Nation as a whole which belong to, although not expressed in, the grant of powers is in direct conflict with the doctrine that this is a Government of enumerated powers. That this is such a Government clearly appears from the Constitution, independently of the amendments, for otherwise there would be an instrument granting certain specified things made operative to grant other and distinct things. This natural construction of the original body of the Constitution is made absolutely certain by the tenth amendment. This amendment, which was seemingly adopted with prescience of just such contention as the present, disclosed the widespread fear that the National Government might, under the pressure of a supposed general welfare, attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted. With equal determination the framers intended that no such assumption should ever find justification in the organic act, and that if in the future further powers seemed necessary they should be granted by the people in the manner they had provided for amending that act. It reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." The argument of counsel ignores the principal factor in this article, to wit, "the people." Its principal purpose was not the distribution of power between the United States and the States, but a reservation to the people of all powers not granted. The preamble of the Constitution declares who framed it—"we, the people of the United States," not the people of one State, but the people of all the States—and Article X reserves to the people of all the States the powers not delegated to the United States. The powers affecting the internal affairs of the States not granted to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively, and all powers of a national character which are not delegated to the National Government by the Constitution are reserved to the people of the United States. The people who adopted the Constitution knew that in the nature of things they could not foresee all the questions which might arise in the future, all the circumstances which might call for the exercise of further national powers than those granted to the United States, and after making provision for an amendment to the Constitution by which any needed additional powers would be granted they reserved to themselves all powers not so delegated.

#### REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair will declare morning business closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a telegram from the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], stating that his train has been delayed some two or three hours and requesting me to submit a motion to the Senate which he would make if he were present. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6060, being the immigration bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The pending amendment is the one offered by Mr. THOMAS, as modified, proposing to strike out certain words on page 9, lines 6 to 12, and in lieu thereof to insert:

That the following classes of persons, when otherwise qualified for admission under the laws of the United States, shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious, political, or racial persecution, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt acts or by discriminatory laws or regulations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, I am opposed to the literacy test embodied in the pending bill; but, if it is to be the judgment of the Senate that it should be retained, I am in favor of the amendment now pending, which extends the immunity class of aliens so as to embrace those who are escaping racial persecution as well as political and religious persecution.

Mr. President, when it is proposed to abandon a policy which has contributed much to the greatness of the Republic, the advocates of the plan might properly be expected to present some reasons justifying the departure which they recommend. The reasons that have been advanced are not persuasive to me, and to my mind furnish a wholly inadequate basis for the suggestion that a policy which has been favored by this Government since its beginning should now be cast aside.

The policy of the American Government has always been to encourage free and unrestricted immigration. We have held out our country as the asylum of the oppressed of all the world, and because of that policy we have seen our settlement of three millions of people, scattered along the Atlantic coast, grow in a little more than a century to one of the great and powerful nations of the earth.

What reasons are suggested for the abandonment of this policy at this time? It is said that ignorance is a menace in a republic. I deny it. Ignorance may be a misfortune, but it will become a nation boasting our ideals to penalize the victims of that misfortune. Besides, this proposed literacy test, which is designed to check and prevent immigration, is not confined to the exclusion of the ignorant. A man may be illiterate and yet not ignorant. It has been within the observation of all of us that there are many intelligent men who are nevertheless illiterate, as that term is understood. My mind reverts to a citizen of a Southern State who was one of the most intelligent men in his community, and yet he could neither read nor write. He was a good, law-abiding, industrious citizen, willing to support his Government in time of peace and, if need be, in time of war to give his life in defense of the liberties of the Republic. Was he an undesirable citizen? He was without education, but a son of that illiterate was elevated to the high post of attorney general of his State and another son came to the House of Representatives and made a brilliant reputation that survived his departure from that body.

I knew a resident of a New England State who never knew the privilege of learning to read and write, but he was a good, honest, industrious citizen. I would match his patriotism against that of any Member of this body. In his simple way he contributed something to the community in which he lived, and when he died his influence permeated that State in the splendid achievements of two of his sons who had won rank and reputation as clergymen and another of whom was elevated to the bench of one of the high courts of another State. No, Senators, it is a mistake to urge that an illiterate is ignorant; I deny it.

Those aliens who are undesirable are provided against by other and specific provisions of this bill. Of course it is said that while this system may not be the best means of excluding undesirable aliens, it is, nevertheless, as good as any that has been proposed. I deny that. We have in other parts of this bill safe and adequate provisions tending to exclude from our shores all undesirable aliens. It provides for the exclusion specifically of all immigrants who are mentally, morally, and physically unfit. We provide for the exclusion of the criminal and the vicious. We provide specifically for the exclusion of all who may become a charge upon any State or upon any community. How much further should you go? Have you not embraced within those classes all who would be undesirable? If you have, what excuse is there for imposing for the first time in the history of the Republic an educational test upon those who seek the opportunities and are willing to assume the burdens of living with us in this country.

Why, Senators, if this educational test had been applied years ago its operation would have excluded the parents of at least one if not two citizens of this Republic who have occupied the White House. It would have excluded from our shores Nancy Hanks, the sainted mother of Abraham Lincoln. It would have made impossible the entrance into our country of President Andrew Johnson, who never knew how to write his name or read a line until he was taught by his wife after his marriage. If that test had been applied years ago, there are honorable and distinguished Members of this exalted body who would not to-day be occupying seats in this Chamber.

Senators, we are all a nation of immigrants. Every white man in the United States to-day is either an immigrant or the descendant of an immigrant. How can you justify yourselves now in violating the ideals that you have preached for a century and, with the quintessence of selfishness and ingratitude,

be willing to close the doors and shut the gates upon those unhappy people in other lands who are looking forward to the day when they may be free men upon the free soil of this great Republic?

It is suggested that by permitting free and unrestricted immigration we are doing some injustice to American workmen; that the foreigner comes into competition with American labor. Senators, that has been true for a century; and what is the result of this competition, such as it has been, for that long time? In no place in all the world are the wages of the laborer and workman so high and the hours of service so short as in the United States.

But it is not correct to say that the immigrant comes into competition with American workmen. The work that every succeeding generation of immigrants does is the work that the American will not do. They carry on the tiresome grind with which the American workman will not stain his hand. It is the most unremunerative work. It is the work of building your railroads, of excavating your tunnels, and doing all of that class of work that fortunately the American workman does not find it necessary for him to undertake. Check this immigration and you paralyze our development and arrest the progress of the Nation. We have no better educated nor more patriotic citizenship than the children of the sturdy, though illiterate, aliens who throng to our shores. The percentage of literacy among the children of alien parentage is far higher than among the children of native whites. Immigrants and their offspring have done their share in building up our country and developing its resources. Unskilled labor, which the country needs on the farm and in the workshops and in great mining and railroading enterprises, must necessarily be recruited from the illiterate aliens. The value of the immigrant does not depend upon his ability to read 40 words. It depends upon his industrial capacity, his usefulness for the work of the country, and his probable behavior as a law-abiding citizen. A man meeting these reasonable tests has an economic value which it would be unwise to destroy. A man may be able to read 40 words and yet meet none of these safe and sane requirements which make for character and usefulness.

It is suggested as a reason for this extraordinary departure in our national policies that our country is now crowded, and that policies that we might have permitted 60 or 70 years ago can not safely be continued. Why, Senators, we have in continental United States 3,000,000 square miles of territory, an area twelve times as large as that of Germany. If it be assumed that we have a population of 100,000,000, it means that at the present time we have an average of but 33 persons for every square mile of United States territory. Before the disastrous war that is now afflicting Europe the average population there was 500 persons to the square mile. In Belgium alone it was 650 persons to the square mile. If we assume that a country will maintain 500 persons to the square mile—and the experience of all history demonstrates that that number can be maintained—then, with our vast area, we will not be overcrowded, we will not even approach that condition, until we have a population of 1,500,000,000, something which, in the course of nature, if it ever occurs, can not occur for many centuries.

There are in this country vast tracts of uncultivated and undeveloped land. Why should we not encourage the ambitious, the sturdy, the industrious alien to come and help us till and develop these sections of our country? Our country is in need of development through industrious muscle and brawn. We should welcome men of enterprise, of push, of energy. The aliens who seek admission to our country are men of this type or they would not come. The man who leaves his home and friends in Europe and undergoes the hardship and danger of a long ocean voyage, stimulated by the hope of bettering his condition in life, must be a man of energy and ambition, and these qualities make for desirable citizenship. Our country with its vast area is comparatively uninhabited. We have room and pressing need for more people in time of peace as well as in time of war. Our natural increase is insufficient for the needs and development of our country.

Extraordinary as this departure is from a governmental standpoint, the attitude of the Democratic Party on this question is still more extraordinary. From the earliest days the Democratic Party has been the liberal party. It has been the party that was always prepared to extend a welcome to the foreigner if he was worthy to take his place in this country. It is not surprising that the Republican Party takes the other side of this proposition. It has declared in its national platform in favor of a literacy qualification. The Democratic Party never made such a declaration, and the representatives of the Democratic Party have no commission from the people of the



country to give their aid and encouragement to an un-Democratic and un-American law which excludes the worthy foreigner from a place in this Republic. Presidents Cleveland and Taft have vetoed similar laws, and as recently as 1892 the Democratic Party, in national convention, declared as follows:

We condemn and denounce any and all attempts to restrict the immigration of the industrious and worthy of foreign lands.

Enact this law and you repudiate this declaration.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to say a word intended especially for my Democratic brethren. The political prospects of our party are not as bright as we would like them to be today. Republicans are asserting, with apparent confidence, that in the contest two years from now the Democratic Party will be unable to carry a single State north of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi. Some little support is given to those Republican claims by a declaration made but a day or two ago by the governor of a great Democratic State in the South. Political predictions two years in advance are not of much value, and I believe these Republican predictions will not be realized. But we should not ignore the existing conditions. One thing is certain, there is no demand in the North for this literacy inhibition and disqualification. Do you wish to make our struggle two years from now worse than it naturally must be by estranging from us thousands and hundreds of thousands who, if this bill is passed, will say that while the Republican Party was once the exclusive party the Democratic Party has taken its place, and that having repudiated its historic attitude toward the foreign born now has become the party of exclusion?

I urge you, Senators, before you give your approval to this literacy test, to think of our political necessities in the North. In this connection let me say frankly, and with the best and kindest spirit, that I can not understand why my distinguished brethren from Southern States, who are comparatively strangers to the immigration problem, are so insistent that immigration must be checked when the number of foreign illiterates in their States is insignificant; only 1,000, 2,000, or 3,000 in some instances, while even among the white natives the illiteracy runs as high as fifty and seventy thousand. Why, I ask, are those who apparently are not immediately concerned with this great problem so insistent upon closing the doors to the worthy alien who is ambitious to enjoy the opportunities and to assume the responsibilities that attach to our citizenship?

Let me assure you, Senators, that there is no demand in the Democratic Party in the North for this restrictive policy, for this repudiation of the professions of the Democratic Party of 125 years. The great Democracy of New York has not asked for it; and I want to say again, and remind my southern friends, that it may happen in the future, as it has happened in the past, that when the solid Democracy of the South looked upon the horizon the only kindly, sympathetic spot on this continent which gave comfort to their gaze and encouragement to their hopes was the State of New York, which did not falter in its devotion to the Democratic Party when a hostile political doctrine dominated the rest of the country excepting the Southern States.

You have heard from the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE], who is competent to speak for the Democracy of his State. He protests against it. I have not yet heard a single favorable opinion of the proposed policy from anyone competent to speak for the Democracy of the North. Surely the great State so well represented by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] does not ask for it, and will protest against it. What is to be gained by it?

I ask those who advocate this restrictive policy what is to be gained by it? We need immigration. Why, we need it more than some of us appreciate. Do you stop to realize that the birth rate among the native Americans is year by year getting lower and lower? Fortunately, in that respect we are not so badly off as France, but we may profit by her example. At the time of the Franco-Prussian War—44 years ago—France had a population of 37,000,000; Germany had 40,000,000. In the intervening 44 years the population of Germany has increased to 70,000,000, while the French are almost where they were 44 years ago, because they only show a net increase of 2,000,000. If we do not encourage foreign immigration, the consequences will be upon our own heads; the misfortune will be felt by the American people.

Mr. President, the agitation for the exclusion of the immigrant at this time seems to be one of the manifestations of hysteria now afflicting the American people. They want change. They want experiment. There was a time in our history when we were regarded as an indestructible Union of indestructible States. Nearly every one of the great propositions urged in the Congress in the recent past has been entirely destructive of

State rights. The wisdom of the fathers is no longer respected. There are those who think they can improve upon the work of the venerable men who made our Constitution. A movement is now engaging the attention of the country by which a number of States are eager to impose on unwilling States their belief in prohibition. There are other States that are seeking to impose on unwilling States their views regarding woman suffrage. In the consideration of this bill there are States having no immediate interest in the subject that are striving to interfere with the liberty of the States that are willing to encourage immigration—that want immigration. When will an end come to this extraordinary hysteria and its manifestations?

Mr. President, for myself, I believe this proposed legislation unwise and destructive of the best interests of this country. I hope it will not have the approval of this body. If, unfortunately, it should receive its approval, then I hope the amendment which was proposed by the distinguished and able Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] and to which I took the liberty of proposing an amendment, will be adopted; that is, that the classes to be immune from the literacy test shall not only be those who come to this land seeking to escape religious and political persecution, but that they shall also embrace those who come here seeking to escape racial persecution.

What is the reason for any differentiation of those three elements? It is persecution whose victims we are trying to relieve by this legislation. We might eliminate all these adjectives and say that an alien shall not be required to comply with the literacy test if he comes here seeking to escape persecution. It is of little concern to us whether the persecution he is escaping is religious, political, or racial. It is the persecution itself which ought to warrant us in making a reservation in this bill if, unhappily, we adopt the literacy test.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am very much interested in the Senator's discussion of this question, and if he has given any thought to the phase of it which I am about to mention, I should like to have him discuss it before he takes his seat. Does the Senator know, or is there any way by which he can approximate what percentage of the immigrants that come to this country go to the rural districts?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have not that information; but there are active agencies at work now in my State encouraging the immigrants to go out through the country to the farms and parts of the country where they are needed, as can be testified to by other Senators in this body.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think, though, one of the great dangers that confronts us and which immigration accelerates is the urbanization of our population. While my information is not accurate or extensive, my understanding is that a very large percentage of the people who come here stop in the cities.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Granting that, Senator, do you appreciate how beneficial it is to Mississippi and other Southern States that supply our food market that when we have a large population in the city of New York your State and other similar States indirectly derive an advantage from it? Mr. President, I may on another occasion trespass upon the indulgence of the Senate to submit some further observations in connection with the pending legislation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I can not sympathize with him in his idea of sectionalizing this question. We are a united and harmonious whole as a Government, and you can not create an economic sore or a social evil in any section of the entire country without hurting the whole. These questions are not local issues; they are national.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I have concluded, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. I wish to inquire if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] desires to speak at this time. If he does, I shall be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. LEWIS. I will say to the Senator from Missouri I understand the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] expects to follow the Senator from New York if the Senator from Missouri has no objection.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It makes no difference to me when I proceed.

Mr. LEWIS. I am sure the Senator from Missouri would prefer to defer a little while.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, in view of the range which the discussions have taken upon this question, I feel rather impelled to address myself to that feature of the bill that deals with the literacy test, and in doing that to examine to some extent the history of immigration legislation, the in-

vestigation of immigration conditions which has been made by the commission appointed for that purpose, and the reasons upon which they recommend the adoption of the literacy test as the one most feasible method of restricting certain classes of immigration which seem undesirable.

I wish to say in this connection that when I entered the Senate I was opposed to any restrictive measure whatever. I believed with the Senator from New York that our area was so great, our resources so unbounded, that we were able to receive aliens in unlimited numbers from every part of Europe, to utilize them, to assimilate them, and make it to their advantage and our own to have them come.

During the years I have served upon the Committee on Immigration, and especially since serving as a member of the Immigration Commission which made an exhaustive examination of this subject, I have been compelled to reverse my opinions and have come to favor some measure that shall in some degree restrict certain streams of immigration which have more recently been coming to our country.

In order to understand the situation we must remember that down to 1882 there was no Federal legislation regulating immigration into this country. In that year legislation was adopted which had for its basis the principle of selection. In other words, all legislation from that time until the present has been based upon the principle that all shall be admitted who are sound in body, sound in mind, and of good moral character. The object of all legislation has been to reject those who were unsound in body and unsound in mind and who were undesirable by reason of their personal character.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION.

The law of 1907 was simply the old law rewritten with amendments added to make the selections more perfect, but in that law there was a provision providing for the appointment of a commission to investigate all phases of the subject of immigration. The commission spent three years in its work and has made its report, which is contained in 41 volumes, the first two of which contain a summary of everything contained in the entire number.

The scope of its work I do not need to describe at this time. It is sufficient to say that it covered every phase of the subject both in this country and abroad. The pending measure is the existing law, with such provisions added as were recommended by the Immigration Commission and which have been recommended also by the Department of Labor, the latter mostly of an administrative character.

The most important provision in this bill—the one which has been most discussed—is that providing for the literacy test. Inasmuch as the discussion has indicated that this is looked upon as a moral test, a quality test, rather than a restrictive test, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the statement of the Immigration Commission upon that subject. I read from their recommendation on page 45 of volume 1, where they say:

The measure of the rational, healthy development of a country is not the extent of its investment of capital, its output of products, or its exports and imports, unless there is a corresponding economic opportunity afforded to the citizen dependent upon employment for his material, mental, and moral development.

The development of business may be brought about by means which lower the standard of living of the wage earners. A slow expansion of industry which would permit the adaptation and assimilation of the incoming labor supply is preferable to a very rapid industrial expansion which results in the immigration of laborers of low standards and efficiency, who imperil the American standard of wages and conditions of employment.

The commission made a number of recommendations, which I omit at this time, but I direct attention to paragraph 8 of their recommendations, where they say:

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, a condition which demands legislation restricting the further admission of such unskilled labor.

I want to impress that phrase "unskilled labor" upon the minds of Senators, and I propose before I shall have concluded my remarks to give ample reasons for this recommendation. The commission adds:

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

(a) A sufficient number be debarré to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

(b) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

(c) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should also be those who by reason of their personal qualities or habits would least readily be assimilated or would make the least desirable citizens.

The commission then proceeds as follows:

The following methods of restricting immigration have been suggested:

(a) The exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language.

(b) The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.

(c) The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.

(d) The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.

(e) The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.

(f) The material increase of the head tax.

(g) The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of men with families.

Then the commission say:

All these methods would be effective in one way or another in securing restrictions in a greater or less degree. A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

The commission as a whole recommends restriction—

I want to emphasize that fact—that every member of that commission recommended restriction.

The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations, furnishes in its report reasons for such restriction, and points out methods by which Congress can attain the desired result if its judgment coincides with that of the commission.

It is an open secret that of the nine members of that commission there was only one who declined to join in recommending the adoption of the reading test as the most feasible single method of securing restriction of immigration of the character set forth in their report.

Now, in order to determine—

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAULSBURY in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Gladly.

Mr. REED. If it would not disturb the course of the Senator's remarks, I call his attention to the fact that he stated in the early part of his address that it was desirable to exclude immigrants from certain countries. I am interested in knowing, in order that I may follow the course of the Senator's logic, what races and countries he alluded to.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. To whom this test should apply?

Mr. REED. No; whom it was desirable to exclude.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. No race or country.

Mr. REED. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I did not say that. At least, I did not intend to say it.

Mr. REED. Then I misunderstood the Senator; and, of course, if I misunderstood him—

Mr. DILLINGHAM. No; I stated that certain streams of immigration that have been going to particular sections of this country where labor is overcrowded would be more particularly affected by this test than other streams of immigration.

Mr. REED. While that is not what I understood the Senator to say, and I probably misunderstood him, we understand now the Senator meant to say just what he is now saying.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Precisely.

Mr. REED. Now, what streams of immigration does the Senator refer to? Will he make that a little more definite?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If the Senator will bear with me, I will take up that whole question and discuss the different streams of immigration, of what nationalities they consist, where they have gone, how they are employed, the conditions under which they are living, and how the reading test would affect them. It will take me some time to do it, but if the Senator will have patience with me, I will proceed.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

#### THE OLD AND THE NEW TYPES OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In order to understand the basis of such recommendation we must follow these streams, note their course, and measure their volume. In doing this we want to remember one remarkable fact, because we have had two types of immigration in this country—what the commission terms the old type of immigration and also what they term the new type. Down to 1882, 87 per cent of all European immigration coming into the United States came from western and northern Europe—England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, France, the Scandinavian States, and Belgium. Eighty-seven per cent down to the time when we first adopted legislation upon this subject came from that section, and only 13 per cent of the whole came from other sections of Europe. Yet we find 25 years later that this 87 per cent coming from northern and western Europe had been reduced to 20 per cent, so that 80



per cent of the entire immigration was coming from other sections of Europe; very largely from eastern and southern Europe.

Prior to the Civil War we had received about 5,000,000 aliens and they became thoroughly assimilated under the fusing heat of that contest. From 1860 to 1882, when we adopted our first legislation upon this subject, we had received something over 6,000,000 aliens, very largely, probably 80 per cent, from northern and western Europe. Since 1882 we have received 21,000,000 aliens into this country, making in the whole more than 32,000,000 who have come since the foundation of the Government, and 27,000,000 have been admitted since the beginning of the Civil War. This number becomes impressive when you remember that at that time the population of the United States was only 31,000,000.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator tell us whether those are the figures showing the net increase of aliens—

Mr. DILLINGHAM. They represent the number of aliens admitted.

Mr. REED. Or the gross immigration.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. They do not take into consideration those who have returned.

Mr. REED. What period of time does the Senator cover with those figures?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The last statement I made was that about 27,000,000 have come since 1860.

Mr. REED. Up to the present time?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. REED. At least one-half of those people are dead by this time.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Of course many of them are dead.

Mr. REED. Could the Senator give us the aggregate of the people of the United States who have died during that time so that we can get a proper comparison?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am unable to give those statistics. I do not know whether they are available or not.

Mr. REED. The point I am making, and I just want to make it plain, is this: It is absolutely unfair to take the total number of immigrants who have come to a country in a half century of time and compare that total of all who came in a half century of time with the fixed population in a given period, because you are comparing the living and the dead of the immigrants with only the living population of the country.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have made no such statement as that. I will say for the benefit of the Senator from Missouri that the statistics show that substantially one-third of the immigrants admitted return to the Old World.

#### THE OLD IMMIGRATION.

The immigration of 1860-1882, and known as the old immigration, came mostly from England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Germany, France, Scandinavia, and Belgium. It went almost wholly to the great Central West, to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the homestead act which was adopted during the Civil War. During the period between 1860 and 1910 the number of farms in this country increased from 2,500,000 to 6,000,000, and we are told that the agricultural area thus opened up is as great as the whole area of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland, Portugal, and the Netherlands all combined. In the homestead act there was an invitation to men to come not only from the East and the West, but from Europe as well, to come with their families to take up these lands and to establish homes. The immigration of that period consisted almost wholly of home-makers who quickly became assimilated, who made splendid citizens, and who have added greatly to the progress of the Nation.

The system of railroad construction in the United States entered upon during the Civil War, and which has come to be the greatest system ever developed in any country, also served to attract them. Substantially one-seventh of the entire national wealth has been invested in the construction and equipment of the railroads of the country. In mileage they exceed all the railroads of Europe. These men helped us in this vast development, as they have helped us to establish the vast trade now existing between the States.

Of the immigration of that period, 75 per cent came from the countries I have named, and it proceeded to the sections I have indicated. I have in my hand a table from which it appears that between 1850 and 1860, 52 per cent of such immigration went to the Central West; from 1860 to 1870, 55½ per cent went there; from 1870 to 1880, 56 per cent went there, and only 27 per cent went to the Atlantic States.

#### THE NEW IMMIGRATION.

During the decade from 1880 to 1890 the type of immigration changed; only 46½ per cent went to the Central West,

while 43½ per cent went to the Atlantic States. From 1890 to 1900 the change was still more marked; only 12½ per cent went to the Central States, while 80½ per cent went to the Atlantic States. This change in the distribution of the immigrant masses was indicative of the change in its character, as well as the change in the industrial conditions of the country which induced them to come in such largely increased numbers.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit one question there?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Did not the movement of the American-born citizen to the cities correspond almost exactly in proportion with the increase of the foreigners in the cities? In other words, was there any greater movement of the foreigner to the cities than there was of the American-born citizen to the cities?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think there has been an altogether greater movement in that direction by the foreign element.

Mr. REED. Does not the Senator know that in those States that are peculiarly American, as that term is ordinarily applied, there has been a constant increase in the city population, that there has been a constant decrease of the farm population, that the influx of foreigners into the cities has not been any greater in proportion than has been the influx of Americans, and that that movement of both foreigners and Americans from the farm to the city has been purely an economic movement?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. It is undoubtedly true that there has been an increase in the population of the cities of the world as commerce has increased and as industries have been established, but I think I shall be able to show that the conditions which have induced the very large immigration of recent years have sprung from the great industries located in the cities of the North; that the current of immigration has been toward the seats of the great basic industries, and that the type of this new immigration differs from the old in that it has sought employment in our manufactures rather than in tilling the soil.

#### INCREASED DEMAND FOR LABOR IN UNITED STATES.

To understand this movement we have only to remember that in 1860 the value of our manufactured products annually was only \$2,000,000,000, but that in 1910 such products amounted to \$20,000,000,000. During the intervening period the products of our mills not only became equal to those of France or of Great Britain or of Germany as individual nations, but we passed them, as Bismarck had prophesied we would do, at a gallop. To-day the products of our mills are greater in value than the combined manufactured products of England, Germany, and France. It is because of the marvelous growth of these industries in the United States that the immigration of recent years has occurred. It represents races entirely different in stock from ours and conditions so entirely different that we can hardly comprehend them. It comes largely from Russia, Austria-Hungary, the Balkan States, and Italy, especially south Italy, in which nations conditions are below those in western and northern Europe and vastly below those existing in the United States.

Mr. LODGE. As, for instance, Syria and Armenia.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes; I have omitted the Syrians and Armenians, as the Senator from Massachusetts suggests. Consider conditions in south Italy, from which we have received such vast numbers. When the commission was there in 1907 it appeared that the average wage paid to agricultural laborers had been 25 cents a day until the emigration from Italy to the United States had been so great in volume that the price of labor had been so enhanced that at that time the price paid was 40 cents a day, although they did not include the keep of the laborer.

What was true in southern Italy has been true in Austria; it has been true in Hungary; it has been true in Russia. The wages are far lower in those countries than in Great Britain, and lower than they are in Germany, although German wages are not high. It is because of the low wages paid in these countries and consequent low living conditions, and a knowledge of the better conditions and the larger opportunities afforded working men in America, that such large numbers have been seeking our shores.

#### CONDITIONS IN EUROPE WHICH ENCOURAGE EMIGRATION.

In its report, volume 1, page 186, the commission discusses the causes which induce emigration from European countries. I ask permission to insert an extract from the commission's report upon that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The purely economic condition of the wageworker is generally very much lower in Europe than in the United States. This is especially true of the unskilled-laborer class from which so great a proportion of the emigration to the United States is drawn. Skilled labor also is

poorly paid when compared with returns for like service in the United States, but the opportunity for continual employment in this field is usually good and the wages sufficiently high to lessen the incentive to emigration. A large proportion of the emigration from southern and eastern Europe may be traced directly to the inability of the peasantry to gain an adequate livelihood in agricultural pursuits either as laborers or proprietors. Agricultural labor is paid extremely low wages, and employment is quite likely to be seasonal rather than continuous. In cases where peasant proprietorship is possible the land holdings are usually so small, the methods of cultivation so primitive, and the taxes so high that even in productive years the struggle for existence is a hard one, while a crop failure means practical disaster for the small farmer and farm laborer alike. In agrarian Russia, where the people have not learned to emigrate, a crop failure results in a famine, while in other sections of southern and eastern Europe it results in emigration, usually to the United States. Periods of industrial depression, as well as crop failures, stimulate emigration, but the effect of the former is not so pronounced, for the reason that disturbed financial and industrial conditions in Europe are usually coincidental with like conditions in the United States, and at such times the emigration movement is always relatively smaller.

The fragmentary nature of available data relative to wages in many European countries makes a satisfactory comparison with wages in the United States impossible. It is well known, however, that even in England, Germany, France, and other countries of western Europe wages are below the United States standard, while in southern and eastern Europe the difference is very great. The commission found this to be true in its investigations in parts of Italy, Austria-Hungary, Greece, Turkey, Russia, and the Balkan States. In fact, it may safely be stated that in these countries the average wage of men engaged in common and agricultural labor is less than 50 cents per day, while in some sections it is even much lower. It is true that in some countries agricultural laborers receive from employers certain concessions in the way of fuel, food, etc., but in cases of this nature which came to the attention of the commission the value of the concessions was insufficient to materially affect the low wage scale.

It is a common but erroneous belief that peasants and artisans in the European countries from which the new immigrant comes can live so very cheaply that the low wages have practically as great a purchasing power as the higher wages in the United States. The low cost of living among the working people, especially of southern and eastern Europe, is due to a low standard of living rather than to the cheapness of food and other commodities. As a matter of fact, meat and other costly articles of food, which are considered as almost essential to the everyday table of the American workingman, can not be afforded among laborers in like occupations in southern and eastern Europe. The same is true of the American standard of housing, clothing, and other things which enter into the cost of living.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if I do not interrupt the Senator from Vermont to his inconvenience, at this very point might I ask him for information—first assuring him that certain people for whom I speak assert that the commission to which the Senator alludes and from whose report he draws his extracts, was made up of membership wholly excluding any person whomsoever having knowledge of, much less bearing any racial relation to, the people whom they now ask to have excluded, and for that reason those people living in the city from whence I come and the State which I represent with my colleague, contend that this very commission on which the able Senator now descants, is partial as against them, for that they were allowed neither voice, hearing, nor representation—will the Senator at some time in the course of his remarks, when it does not divert him from a regular arrangement, address himself to that point, so that I may have his views on it?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I am not quite sure that I comprehend the inquiry of the Senator, but I will say that the Immigration Commission as constituted was made up of three Senators, three Representatives, and three gentlemen from civil life, appointed by the President. From the Senate there were five different Members at various times, one or two having died. Of the three gentlemen who came from civil life one was Mr. William R. Wheeler, of California; another was Prof. Jenks, of Cornell University; and the third was Dr. Neill, who was Commissioner of Labor and who was from Texas.

The people from Chicago who were referred to, were heard by the commission, and investigations were made, as will appear further on in my remarks, of the industries in Chicago and in all parts of the country.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator to inquire whether or not, according to his information, wages have been increased since the data which the Senator is to insert in this part of his remarks were compiled by the commission? Does the Senator know whether in recent years, since those data were compiled, wages have advanced in those countries to which the data apply?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I do not know to what extent wages have advanced. I know that in Italy we found farm labor had advanced from 25 cents to 40 cents a day during the 10 or 15 years in which we received such a vast volume of immigrants from that country. Beyond that I am unable to state.

Mr. FLETCHER. Can the Senator give us the date when those tables were prepared?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. They were prepared in 1907.

Mr. FLETCHER. One further question in that connection. I desire to ask whether the Senator is advised as to the cost of living in those countries since then—whether or not the price of food products has gone up? That might have some bearing on the question of wages in those countries.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think that the prices of commodities have advanced to a certain extent throughout the world, but not uniformly by any means.

Mr. FLETCHER. I wanted to bring that information, if I could, down to date.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I should be glad to have any statement the Senator has in his possession.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no statement, only a memorandum given me while in France last August, showing that the wages paid farm hands in France were from 40 to 60 cents a day with board, or 60 to 80 cents a day without board. Then there are other schedules of wages. I do not know that it is very material in this connection; but inasmuch as the Senator was putting into the Record the data furnished by the commission in 1907 as to wages in certain foreign countries, I thought it would be better to bring the information down to date, if it could be done, showing the changes.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I have stated that wages in western Europe were higher than they were in eastern Europe. It has been stated by writers on economics that you may trace the history of free institutions by the rate of wages paid in a country, and we know that in Great Britain, in Germany, in France, and in western Europe generally institutions are much more free than they are in eastern and southern Europe. I have no doubt that wages in France are higher than they are in the section which I was mentioning.

BEST OF PEASANT CLASS COME.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Immigration Commission did not recommend the exclusion of any particular race or nationality, but they recommended the adoption of the literacy test in the hope that it would limit to some extent certain streams of immigration which had been admitted in such volume that the market for common or unskilled labor in the United States was found to be overcrowded to such a degree that immigrants of this class were competing against themselves. The commission had no prejudice against any one of the nations that have been mentioned or against their people. The immigration from those countries is largely of the peasant class; and we undoubtedly get the best of that class, because only those come who have a desire to better their conditions and with that desire enterprise enough to scrape together the money necessary for the outlay, and courage enough to assume the responsibility of the change.

GOOD PHYSICAL CONDITION—HOW SECURED.

Not only that, but the immigrants are as a rule a good class from a physical standpoint.

Our laws against the admission of diseased persons are broad and comprehensive, and they are rigidly enforced. Among the classes excluded are idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, paupers, persons likely to become a public charge, professional beggars, persons afflicted with tuberculosis or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living, persons who have been convicted of committing a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, polygamists, anarchists, prostitutes, women or girls coming into the United States for the purposes of prostitution, and so forth.

These provisions of the law are not only enforced at our ports, but a medical examination of every proposed emigrant is required at all ports of embarkation in foreign nations. Under that law we say to the steamship companies: "If you bring to this country an idiot or an imbecile, or an insane person, or one who has epilepsy or who has tuberculosis, or who has a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, whose condition might have been discovered by a competent medical examination at the port of embarkation, we will impose a fine upon you of \$100"—\$200 I think it is now—"and compel you to transport that person back to the country whence he came." That provision of the law has relieved the officers at our ports very largely of the burden which they formerly bore, as it has greatly reduced the number of the defective classes presenting themselves for admission. The result has been that the steamship companies, at their own expense, have employed surgeons



to examine with reference to all of these diseases every person who offers himself or herself as an intended immigrant to the United States.

As a consequence, so many were discarded at the ports of Germany that they became a burden upon the cities where such examinations were held. The German Government then compelled the steamship companies to establish what they call "control stations" all along the borders of Germany, at which every intended immigrant to the United States coming from Russia or from Austria or from Hungary or from Italy to a German port to take ship is compelled to be examined at the expense of the steamship company. If the immigrant is unable to pass this medical examination, he is sent back to the country whence he came and does not become a burden to Germany. So that all those coming from foreign ports are examined abroad, and those coming from Germany are twice examined. As a result of such examinations, nearly 40,000 intended immigrants were rejected at foreign ports during the year 1907, and our officers were saved from the necessity of sending them back upon their arrival at an American port. To be accurate, during the 13 months to December 31, 1907, there were rejected at ports of embarkation 27,799; at the control station which I have mentioned, 11,882; making in all 39,681. During the same period there were rejected at our own ports about 13,000, making in all something over 52,000 who were rejected because of physical or mental defects. So that, with such examinations as I have indicated, the immigrants who are admitted to this country as a whole are a splendid body of people from a physical standpoint.

In addition to that they are, from the standpoint of age when admitted, a most desirable class. Ninety-five per cent of them were under 45 years of age. Substantially 83 per cent of them were between 14 and 45 years of age. In other words, the great proportion of them were admitted at a time in life when they were capable of maintaining themselves.

#### NOT HOMEMAKERS—PREPONDERANCE OF MALES.

There are, however, some characteristics connected with the immigration from eastern and southern Europe which must not be disregarded. And I can not do better, perhaps, than to direct the Senate's attention specifically to some of the races and nationalities which contribute most largely to the "new immigration," as it is called. During the period of 15 years, 1899-1913, we admitted nearly 8,000,000 immigrants of the following races, named in order according to the relative importance of each in the numbers admitted: South Italians, Hebrews, Polish, North Italians, Slovaks, Croats, Slovenians, Hungarians, Greeks, Lithuanians, and Ruthenians. Out of that entire number, 66 per cent are Italians, Hebrews, and Polish. The significant feature of this immigration is that 73 per cent of the whole were males.

Have they come here to make homes? Have they brought their families, as did the immigration from northern and western Europe?

I have before me another table showing the percentage of males among the aliens coming in the years 1899 to 1910, for the 10 leading races, from which the same startling fact appears. Of the South Italians, Hebrews, Polish, Slovaks, North Italians, Hungarians, Croats, Slovenians, Greeks, Lithuanians, and Ruthenians, furnishing a total immigration of 5,989,000, 73 per cent were males.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. We do not get from the description of all those classes and where they come from an idea as to where the Hebrews come from. The Senator says "South Italians, Poles, and Hebrews" without specifying from where the Hebrews come.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. They come from all sections, but very largely from Russia and from Austria.

I will say that of these different nationalities 78 per cent of the South Italians were males. Only 56 per cent of the Hebrews were males. On the other hand, of the Polish 69 per cent were males; of the Slovaks, 70 per cent; of the North Italians, 78 per cent; of the Hungarians, 72 per cent; and of the other races even a larger percentage.

#### MOSTLY COMMON LABORERS.

Another significant factor in the problem lies in the fact that while this new immigration is made up so largely of males, it consists almost wholly of common or unskilled laborers. In volume 1, page 121, of the commission's report, a table will be found which shows that common or farm laborers, or those

without occupation, received during the 12 years from 1899 to 1910 constituted the following proportions of the immigration by races in that period:

South Italians, 85.4 per cent; Hebrews, 32.9 per cent; Polish, 93.7 per cent; Slovaks, 95.6 per cent; north Italians, 79.6 per cent; Hungarians, 91.4 per cent; Croats and Slovenians, 95 per cent; Greeks, 92.3 per cent; Lithuanians, 93.3 per cent; Ruthenians, 79.5 per cent. Of the Bulgarians, Servians, and Montenegrins, 96.7 per cent of them belong to those classes; of the Finnish, 94 per cent; of the Roumanians, 97.3 per cent; and of the Portuguese, 93 per cent. So it appears that the males making up this immigration were almost wholly common or farm laborers in the countries from whence they come. You would naturally think, therefore, that they would go to the farms in this country. But have they done so? I regret to say that they have not.

I was interested in what the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] said this morning about the area of our land and the opportunity there is for this class of immigrants to find places upon the soil; but the fact is that the new immigration does not go to the soil. It proceeds almost wholly and directly to the cities. From the year 1880 to 1909, a period of 30 years—and I might say that this will be an answer to an inquiry that was made in the debate this morning by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN]—we received from Austria-Hungary, in round numbers, 2,850,000 immigrants; from Italy, 2,801,000; from Russia, 2,134,000; in all, 7,785,000 immigrants. That was in the period of 30 years. Now, the census of 1910 reveals the most remarkable fact that of that entire number less than 1 per cent were found in that year to be managers of farms in this country, either as owners or as tenants. To be exact, only nine-tenths of 1 per cent of the entire immigration from those countries, covering a period of 30 years, was found managing farms in this country, either as owners or as tenants.

#### INCREASE AND DECREASE OF DIFFERENT RACES IN THE UNITED STATES.

The census also shows that during the last 10 census years there was an absolute decrease in the residents of this country who had their birth in northern and western Europe. Of those born in Great Britain, Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, Ireland, and France there was an absolute decrease of almost 4 per cent—to be accurate, 3.9 per cent—in this country; while, on the other hand, there was an increase of 175.5 per cent in the residents of this country who had come from Portugal, Spain, Italy, Russia, Finland, Austria-Hungary, Roumania, Servia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, and Greece.

The percentage of increase in the population of this country among certain races is shown in the fact that those from Greece have increased during the 10 census years 1,000 per cent, those from Italy 177.5 per cent, those coming from Russia and Finland 170.4 per cent, and from Austria-Hungary 162.3 per cent.

I call attention to these facts to show the trend of the modern immigration, how different it is from the old immigration, and I propose as I proceed to show where they have gone and how they are employed.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator if he has the figures showing the proportion of Italian immigrants from north Italy and from south Italy, respectively?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have not it at my command at this moment, but the immigration from south Italy is vastly greater than that from north Italy and differs in character in every way. It differs in racial origin and in instincts and in business habits. I suppose 56 per cent of the southern Italians are illiterate, while probably not more than 4 or 5 per cent of the northern Italians are illiterate, and yet the same law governs both sections of the country. The two classes differ in origin, in education, mental characteristics, and in occupation.

#### NEW IMMIGRATION FOUND MOSTLY IN CITIES.

Now, as to the trend of the people who have come to this country: I am speaking still from the census reports. I find that of the more than a million Italians found in this country when the last census was taken, 78 per cent were in the cities.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a word?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Gladly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. It seems to me this may be very readily accounted for by the fact that the cities, with

their great manufacturing industries, must necessarily offer better and larger wages than the agricultural regions can offer.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. The Senator is undoubtedly right, and that is just the point I am making—that these people come over and go to the cities, where the manufacturing are located, where the sewers are to be installed, where the street railroads are to be constructed. They flow directly toward the great centers of industry.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have held, and still hold—I want to say just what I feel—that the iniquities of the high protective system have overstimulated manufacturing industries to a degree that has drawn from the rural population so largely that agriculture has languished, to our detriment—hence the high price of foodstuffs—and our cities have been flooded and overpopulated. Now, I realize the importance and necessity of an immigration bill; I want to vote for an immigration bill; but I am so utterly and totally opposed to the so-called literacy test that if it must remain in the bill, I shall have, very much to my regret, to vote against the whole measure.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Before I conclude, Mr. President, I shall show the ground upon which the commission recommended that test and the facts upon which it based its opinion when that action was taken. Then, of course, the Senator will act upon his judgment.

Returning to the subject of aliens in the cities. Of the Russians in this country, 87 per cent were found to be denizens of the cities, while of those from Austria-Hungary the proportion was 75 per cent; of those from Roumania, 92 per cent; of the Turks, 83 per cent. Of the immigration during the four years immediately preceding the census of 1910, 78.5 per cent of the whole number admitted proceeded directly to the cities. Think of that! Almost eight-tenths of the whole went directly to the centers of population.

I have already commented upon the fact that a very large proportion of these adult men were common or farm laborers in the countries from which they came. Over 70 per cent, probably nearer 75 per cent of them, came from southeastern Europe, and 82 per cent of them went to New England, the Atlantic, and east-north-central States.

I wish you would consider that statement for a moment. New England, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan constitute only about 13 per cent of the area of continental United States, and yet it appears that over 80 per cent of this entire immigration found its destination in that area; and that is where they are found to-day—in the large manufacturing towns of that large manufacturing section of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do.

Mr. REED. Assume that they were not there. It follows, does it not, that if these foreigners were not there, working, the mills would have to shut down or employ somebody else, some natives? You would then have exactly the same degree of congestion in the cities that you now have, so far as numbers are concerned.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. No; I think not.

Mr. REED. Why not?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. We want them there. We welcome immigration. We welcome these races. I have nothing against any one of these races. I am not criticizing them. We want them in sufficient numbers to supply the demand for labor, but under conditions that will enable them to live upon an American basis; but they have come there in such numbers, as our investigation showed, that they are living under conditions that are un-American and absolutely undesirable. They are unable to secure employment a sufficient portion of the time to enable them to live under conditions that we like to have American laborers enjoy. I am coming to that subject a little later on.

Mr. REED. I am addressing myself only to the question of congestion in cities for the present. I can not discuss half a dozen questions at once.

Manifestly, if these people come from Europe, go into New England, and gain employment in the mills, that means the addition of a certain number of people to that population. It also follows that if these men were not working there, and nobody came to take their places, the mills would close. It also follows that if others did come to take their places you would have exactly the same amount of congestion.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Provided the same number came.

Mr. REED. Now, is it not true that the mills of all New England have been complaining for years that the reason why

they can not compete is because they have to pay wages that they claim are too high?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I never heard that.

Mr. REED. Well, is it not true?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. What we claim is, having to pay American wages, that we should have protection as against European labor.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes. Still, you either do pay American wages or you do not. If you have not been paying American wages, then you ought not to have been clamoring for protection. If you have been paying American wages, then these foreigners are collecting American wages and have the ability to live the same as American citizens live.

It seems to me one of those arguments eats up the other. I do not know which it is.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont further yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont whether the lowest American wages paid are not higher than the laborers receiving wages abroad would get?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think the wages paid to these classes—and they were vastly too low—were at least three times as great as the wages they received in the countries from which they came.

Mr. REED. Let me ask one further question: Who fixes the wages of these classes and puts them at a beggarly stipend? Is it the foreign laborer or is it the American employer?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. They are fixed by the conditions in each particular locality. Of course they are fixed by the employer, except where it becomes a matter of agreement, as it is in most cases in Vermont, between the employer and organized labor.

#### THE IMMIGRANT IN THE INDUSTRIES.

It is probable, Mr. President, that from 80 to 90 per cent of all the wages paid in the manufacturing industries of the United States are paid in the States to which I have alluded, and very naturally the immigration coming here to get employment goes where employment is to be had. There is no question but that the employers delight in having on hand a larger force of labor than can be employed at all times, that the supply may be ample in time of unusual activity; but the commission found that immigrants of the new class had come in such excessive numbers that out of kindness to the laborers themselves others of their class should be discouraged from coming.

The commission, in order to investigate the condition of aliens in American industries, sent out their agents and caused to be examined 37 of the leading industries in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains. In doing so they came in contact with 700,000 different employees in the different industries. They made 23,000 family studies, apportioning them among the different classes of industries, and they went into 200 industrial communities to study conditions there. They found that of that 700,000 employees with whom they came in contact 59.9 per cent—call it 60 per cent—of the whole were born abroad, that 15 per cent were their children, and that less than 20 per cent were the sons or the daughters of American-born parents.

In the iron and steel industry they found 57.7 per cent foreign born; in the slaughtering and meat-packing industry, 60.7 per cent; in wool and worsted manufacturing, 61.9 per cent; in the coal industry, 61.9 per cent; in the copper mining and smelting industry, 65.3 per cent; in the leather tanning, currying, and finishing industry, 67 per cent; in cotton-goods manufactures, 68.7 per cent; in clothing manufactures, 72.2 per cent; in silk-goods manufactures, 75.1 per cent, or an average of 65.6 per cent of foreign-born employees in these industries.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will inquire of the Senator whether he has a showing of the percentage of those he has been mentioning who became citizens?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am coming to that later, if the Senator pleases.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think it would have an important bearing to show what per cent of them have become American citizens, registered voters who have become a part of the Government.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have tables bearing upon that subject, but they are farther along in my notes. I will refer to them a little later. I want to say, however, that of the old immigration about three times as many proportionally became citizens as those of the new.

#### OVERCROWDED CONDITIONS.

That the new immigration has overcrowded the industries in the country is shown by the results of the investigation of the commission, perhaps more so in the iron and steel industry than in any other. In their investigations our agents came in



contact with 86,000 employees of the iron and steel industry, and of these 57.7 per cent were foreign born, 13.4 per cent were their sons, constituting 71.4 per cent of the whole. Eighty-eight per cent of all this vast army of employees came from southern and eastern Europe and represented the new immigration. Yet out of that whole number working in the iron and steel industry only 8.6 per cent—less than 9 per cent—ever had any previous experience in it, and 65 per cent of them had been common laborers in the countries from which they came.

It was found in that investigation that the weekly wages paid to these people as a class were, upon an average, \$14.35. Had they been employed full time, they would have received \$750 a year; but, as a matter of fact, the annual average earnings of the 86,000 employees so interviewed amounted to only \$326, or about one-half what they should have earned had they had work during the entire year. As a matter of fact, the industry was so overcrowded with applicants for common unskilled labor that those employed had worked only about one-half the time.

The great body of these laborers are single men, but there were some families among them, and of such families less than 8 per cent were supported by the husband and the children; the balance eked out their income by taking roomers or boarders. Forty-one per cent of them were found to be taking boarders.

The conditions were worse in the iron and steel industry than in any other examined. I will not weary the Senate by going through each one of them separately, but will content myself by saying that in the bituminous-coal industry, silk manufacturing, and the woolen industry it was found that the men had work only two-thirds of the time; in leather, clothing, and oil refining, three-fourths of the time; and in cotton, sugar refining, boots and shoes, and some others, about four-fifths of the time; but we found that everywhere among all the industries of our country there was a greater supply of common unskilled labor than was demanded by the ordinary business of the industries.

#### LEAST DESIRABLE CLASSES.

In their recommendations to Congress the commission says that if we are to reduce any of these streams of immigration, the individuals of which are competing against each other, we should select those that are the least desirable.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has just requested information as to the number among the different classes who have become naturalized citizens of the United States. From the census of 1910 it appears that of the races constituting the old immigration the following had become naturalized or had taken out first papers: Of the Germans, 76.7 per cent; of the English, 66.3 per cent; of the Irish, 73.6 per cent; of the Welsh, 73.7 per cent; of the Swedish, 64.7 per cent; of the Norwegians, 72.3 per cent; of the Danes, 74.2 per cent; of the Swiss, 71.3 per cent; and of the Hollanders, 67.5 per cent.

The number who had become naturalized or who had taken out first papers among the races of the new immigration appears from the following statement: Of the South Italians, only 30 per cent; of the Russian Hebrews, 57.2 per cent; of the other Hebrews, 61.6 per cent; of the Polish, 33 per cent; of the Slovaks, 22.8 per cent; of the North Italians, 45.8 per cent; of the Hungarians, 26.8 per cent; of the Croats, 22.5 per cent; of the Slovenians, 35 per cent; of the Greeks, 20 per cent; of the Lithuanians, 32.5 per cent; and of the Ruthenians, 19.5 per cent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Gladly.

Mr. REED. The Senator has given in these tables the percentage of immigrants who have become naturalized or have taken out their first papers and he has compared what he terms the old immigration with the new. Manifestly an old immigration—that is, an immigration which reached its climax some years ago—can not be justly compared with an immigration which has just reached its climax at this time, because the old immigrant has been here more years upon the average, has had the greater opportunity to become naturalized, whereas the man who has just arrived has had substantially no opportunity at all. Does the Senator think that a comparison of recent immigration with old immigration is a proper test as to the intention of people who have recently come to become American citizens?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. There is very much force in the suggestion made by the Senator from Missouri, but the Senator will remember that the figures I am giving are taken from the census of those in the United States in 1910, and that this new immigration has been coming since 1882 in increasing numbers. Of course those who have come more recently have not had the same opportunity to become citizens as the others. I have no doubt the Senator is right to a certain extent, but, on the other

hand, we have been receiving of the old type immigration substantially one-third of our immigration all this time, and it is just about in the proportion of one-third of the old type and two-thirds of the new type. So we have a very large number from northern and western Europe, who have come recently, as well as from eastern and southern Europe.

Mr. REED. But, nevertheless, to take an example, if there were an aggregate of 10,000,000 foreign-born people in the United States, and if the first 5,000,000 of those people had come from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and four-fifths of that 5,000,000 had been here for 10 years on the average, whereas four-fifths of the other 5,000,000 who came from the other parts of Europe had been here only 2 or 3 years, in endeavoring to ascertain the intention of these people to become American citizens by the test as to the number who had made application for citizenship, the comparison could not be fairly made between the recent immigrant and the one who had been here for many years, speaking on the average.

I want to ask the Senator this question, because it is very pertinent: Does the Senator think that the foreigner who comes here is the more desirable who takes out naturalization papers, or does he think that the one who does not become a citizen is the more desirable?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I think that the man who comes here and brings his family, who comes here for the purpose of casting his lot with us and becoming an American citizen, sharing in our privileges, and assuming his burden of responsibility, is the desirable citizen, and he is the man who naturally takes out his naturalization papers.

Mr. REED. Then the Senator must believe that the addition of the foreign voter to our electorate is a benefit to this country. What, then, becomes of the cry abroad in this land that the foreigner is seizing the Government and running it and therefore is an undesirable citizen?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, in answer to what the Senator from Missouri has said, I think the desirable man to have come to this country is the man who wants to become a citizen of the country. A certain proportion of them may not make desirable citizens; we have a great many American born who are not desirable citizens, but I think that the most desirable immigrant who comes here is the man who comes with the idea of permanency, in the hope and expectation of improving his condition and giving his children the opportunity which this country affords, and he is the man who as a rule takes steps to become a citizen of the United States.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If I may interrupt the Senator, I would like to ask him if he has any statistics as to the percentage of those who returned to the country from which they came?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Taking it year by year, substantially one-third of all who come to this country return to the country from whence they came, and a larger proportion of the new immigration return than of the old immigration.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the average time of their residence here?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am unable to state it. That depends very much upon conditions existing in this country. The very large proportion of our immigrants are wage earners and are leading single lives. I will show you a little later their movements are determined by the industrial conditions in this country.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As I take it, they are undesirable persons for one reason, and that is that they come here and what they accumulate here they take back home with them.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Very largely.

Mr. VARDAMAN. They make no investments here. They do not become a part of the Government.

Mr. REED. In the interest of accuracy I would just like to interrupt the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I shall be very glad to be interrupted.

Mr. REED. Are not the figures which show the net increase of foreign immigration made up in this way: All who come here are counted as immigrants the first time they come in, and all who return to Europe are counted as having left this country and are deducted from the total coming in?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. What figures does the Senator refer to?

Mr. REED. Those the Senator was himself just referring to.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I was giving the results shown by the census of the foreign-born in this country.

Mr. REED. The question was asked by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] what proportion of these immigrants return to Europe, and the Senator said in reply substan-

tially one-third. What I am inquiring about is whether our immigration authorities do not charge up as returning to Europe every man who comes here and who has not become naturalized, even though he may be returning to Europe for only a few months or a few weeks.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think not.

Mr. REED. When they return intending to come back.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If the Senator will permit me, I will state that prior to 1907 the records were not accurately kept. The law did not require it and the best estimate we could make, having examined the question from all available sources, was that substantially one-third returned to the countries from which they came.

Mr. REED. Permanently returned?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Some permanently and some not; but they returned. Under the law of 1907 a record is kept. Unfortunately, I have not that record before me at this time; but a record is kept, showing those who are going abroad temporarily and those who are going permanently, and that record the Senator can secure from the Department of Labor.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). The Senator from Delaware suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Nelson	Shields
Borah	Gallinger	Newlands	Simmons
Brady	Goff	Norris	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Gore	O'Gorman	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Gronna	Overman	Smoot
Bryan	Hardwick	Page	Sterling
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Kern	Pomerene	Swanson
Clapp	Lane	Ransdell	Thomas
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Reed	Thornton
Culberson	Lewis	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	Lippitt	Saulsbury	White
Dillingham	McCumber	Shafroth	Williams
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIVELY].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to announce the fact that my colleague [Mr. WARREN] is unavoidably absent from the city. He is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] is absent on important public business and that he is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] is detained from the city on account of illness in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Vermont will proceed.

#### NOT HOME MAKERS.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, when interrupted I had been speaking of the proportion of the recent immigrants who have become citizens or who have taken out their first papers as one of the elements which enter into the question of their desirability as citizens, but as further showing that the new immigration to a very large extent has not come here for the purpose of establishing homes and becoming members of the great American family I want to call attention to the fact that between 1899 and 1910, a period of 12 years, of all those admitted 69.5 per cent were males and only 30.5 per cent were females. Taking them by nationalities, the proportion of males in the immigration from south Italy was 78.6 per cent; Hebrews, 56.6 per cent; Polish, 69.5; Slovaks, 70.5 per cent; North Italians, 78.3; Hungarians, 72.2; Croatians, 84.9 per cent; Slovenians, 70.5; of the Greeks, 95.1; and Lithuanians, 70.6 per cent, from which it appears that of the nationalities, the races, to which I last referred substantially from 70 to 80 per cent, upon an average, were males, and they constitute a large element in the immigration of those 12 years.

Returning to the commission's investigation of the industries in the United States, the following startling conditions are disclosed: Of the wage earners in the manufactures of America, it was found that 55 per cent of them were married men, but that three-fourths of all the married men had left their wives in Europe, and substantially 86 per cent of all the men engaged in the manufactures of the United States were leading single lives, without any of those home influences which everybody in America recognizes as being so essential to good citizenship. They were living in colonies in the cities and under conditions

which were undesirable and un-American, leading lives that ought not to be led in a country that is self-governing, as is the United States.

#### DANGER TO OUR POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS.

In this connection I direct the attention of the Senate to another startling condition disclosed by the census of 1910, and I want to call it sharply to the attention of every thinking person, to all who are considering seriously the problem that confronts us, and to submit to them the question whether there should not be some measure of restriction to decrease the volume of the streams of immigration that are flowing toward the United States. We can not deny the fact, the census of 1900 shows it, that in that year there were in this country 900,000 aliens, men of 21 years and over, who had not at that time become citizens of the United States. The census of 1910 shows that instead of there being 900,000 of that class there were in the last-named year 2,260,000.

Now, mark the fact, every one of those men is liable to become a citizen of the United States within five years. They belong to the classes that may become naturalized if they so desire. What does it mean to our institutions to have in the United States, and very largely in that little strip of territory reaching from New England to the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio River, 2,260,000 of that class? You can not realize the significance of the situation without instituting comparisons.

#### POSSIBLE FUTURE CITIZENS.

I want to call the attention of the Senators from the Pacific and the Rocky Mountain States to the fact that in California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, North and South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas there were cast for President of the United States at the last election 2,281,000 votes, and yet we had in 1910 in this country alien males over 21 years of age who had not taken the first step toward becoming naturalized citizens of the United States almost equal in number to the entire voting force of those 15 States.

Let me institute another comparison which will interest the gentlemen from the South. In Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, 12 States, the votes cast for President at the last election numbered only 1,922,740. Yet we have right here in the United States, as I have said, 2,260,000 men who are eligible to naturalization, but who had not in 1910 taken out their first papers, a number largely in excess of the entire presidential vote in those 12 States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator desire that those 2,000,000 unnaturalized people shall become naturalized?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not, unless they will bring their wives and their families with them. If they will bring their wives and their families with them, I do not care how quickly they are naturalized; the sooner the better.

Mr. REED. Then, it is solely the fact that they have not brought their wives or that they are not married on which the Senator bases his objection. Does the Senator think that a man who is unmarried is unfit for citizenship in this country?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Not at all, everything else being equal.

Mr. REED. I did not think the Senator would claim that. Is it not a fact that the men who come here, the recent immigrants who have left their wives at home, are simply duplicating what the Germans and the Irish and the Scotchmen did in the days of adversity for their countries when they came here?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I do not think they did it.

Mr. REED. They left their wives at home until they could get money enough to send for them.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I think the Senator from Missouri will find that very few of them did that.

Mr. REED. Is it not a fact that these foreigners are every day bringing their families here just as rapidly as they can get the money to bring them? I do not know what the Senator's experience is, but there is hardly a day in my life which passes when there is not some trouble about getting in the child or the wife of some man who is here, and it takes a good deal of my time trying to assist them through the red tape that has been set up in the Immigration Bureau of the country.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. But, Mr. President, I think the Senator from Missouri forgets the statement that I made, that out of the 700,000 employees in the manufactures of America with whom the commission came into contact three-fourths of the married men had left their wives in Europe.



Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, I undertake to say that the Irish immigration to this country showed substantially the same condition. These people come here with barely enough money to get here; they can not bring their wives with them; but they send back and get them. The Senator from Vermont does not mean to charge these people with having abandoned their families?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If they would send for their wives and bring them here it would be well, but the majority of them do not do so. The Irish immigrants to whom the Senator from Missouri refers intended to bring their wives and the Germans and the English did the same.

Mr. REED. Exactly; and I contend that the people against whom the Senator is now inveighing intend to do the same thing; at least there is no evidence whatever to the contrary.

The Senator speaks of the agents of the Immigration Bureau having come in contact with six or seven hundred thousand people. Manifestly that must have been a very slight contact. It could not have been a real investigation of the homes of these people; that would have been physically impossible.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. We sent out agents and we used a card system, and I have told the Senator the number of homes which we investigated.

Mr. REED. How long had those people been here, on the average, who were here without their wives?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I can not give the Senator the exact time.

Mr. REED. Of course that is very pertinent if they had only been here a few months and had not earned enough money to bring them.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. But you have to assume when an investigation covers 37 industries of the United States, and when a system has been growing with great rapidity since 1860 that the greater portion of the employees must have been here a considerable length of time.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. I will not interrupt him further.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, to show that this vast volume of eligibles to naturalization to which I have just referred, are more largely of the new immigration than of the old, let me again refer to the census of 1910. From this it appears that the proportions of the immigrants of the various races who had failed to take out first papers were as follows: Of the Germans, 9.9 per cent only had failed to take out papers; of the Irish, only 13.8 per cent; of the Canadians, 28.3 per cent; of the English, 18.8; of the Swedes, 14.9; of the Norwegians, 16.2 per cent; of those from Scotland, 21.5 per cent; of those from Denmark, 13.8 per cent; of those from Holland, 19.6 per cent; of those from France, 27.8 per cent; and of those from Wales, 10.3 per cent.

Among those representing the new immigration the percentage was much larger: Of the Russians, there were 52.4 per cent; from Italy, 65.7 per cent; from Austria, 57.3 per cent; from Hungary, 68.2; from Mexico, 66.6 per cent; from Greece, 77.6; from Finland, 45.9 per cent; from Portugal, 64.3 per cent; and from Roumania, 45.2 per cent.

It is apparent that the proportion of those not desiring citizenship is very much larger among those immigrants coming from eastern and southern Europe than those coming from western and northern Europe.

I find, by making another reference to the census, that out of the 3,075,000 of the old immigration in this country in 1910, only 12 per cent, or 370,000, have failed to take out first papers or to become naturalized; while of the new immigration, out of the 1,980,998, 55 per cent, or 1,301,000, had failed to take out such papers.

#### HOW WILL THE READING TEST APPLY.

How will the literacy test apply? What will it accomplish? What races will it most affect? This can best be ascertained by an examination of official records of the Department of Labor. These disclose the fact that in the 11 years from 1899 to 1909 we received of aliens over 14 years of age 7,197,060—of the old immigration 1,983,000, in round numbers, and of the new immigration 5,215,000. Of the old immigration there were only 2.7 per cent who were unable to read, of the new immigration there were 35.6 per cent who were unable to read. In that connection I want to say to the Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] that I do not look upon this as necessarily a test of quality; I would not advocate its adoption upon that ground, although I would rather admit an educated rather than an uneducated person. If education was not desirable as an element of good citizenship, compulsory school laws would not have been adopted in all the States of the Union; we would not be spending vast millions of dollars every year to educate the children of this country at public expense to fit them for

citizenship. Everybody knows that it is a part of our national policy to make men intelligent by education, because intelligence, as well as virtue, is the foundation of our civilization and the guaranty of the stability of free institutions. My advocacy of this amendment is because it is a mild restrictive measure, one intended to restrict the flow of these streams of immigration that have overcrowded with common or unskilled laborers the great centers of industrial operations, where these new elements have competed against each other as well as against American labor in the industries of the country, and because I look upon it as the one most feasible measure for that purpose.

The records of the Department of Labor indicate pretty clearly the scope and operation of this provision. During a period of 11 years—1899 to 1909, inclusive—the percentage of illiterates among the different races admitted was as follows: Only four-tenths of 1 per cent of the Scandinavians were illiterate; only seven-tenths of 1 per cent of the Scotch; only 1.1 per cent of the English; only 2 per cent of the Welsh; only 2.7 per cent of the Irish; only 4.7 per cent of the Dutch; only 5.4 per cent of the Germans; and only 5.4 per cent of the French.

The degree of illiteracy was, it will be observed, very low among all the races of northwestern Europe, and the operation of the reading test will hardly be felt by any of them. On the other hand, out of the million and a half admitted from south Italy, 54.2 per cent were unable to read; out of the 742,000 coming from Poland, or of the Polish race, 35.4 per cent were unable to read; of the almost half million of Hebrews, 25.7 per cent were unable to read; of the 312,000 Slovaks, 24.6 per cent were illiterate; of the 311,000 from north Italy, 11.8 per cent were illiterate; of the 283,000 from Hungary, 11.4 per cent were illiterate; and of about the same number of Croatians and Slovenians and Magyars, 36.4 per cent and 11.4 per cent, respectively, were illiterate; of the Russians, 34.7 per cent were illiterate. It will, therefore, be seen that the literacy test will apply more particularly to those races and nationalities that I have described than to any of the others. It will decrease the number coming from Russia, Austria-Hungary, the Balkan States, and from southern Italy, but will have hardly any effect upon the immigration coming from Great Britain, Germany, Ireland, Wales, the Scandinavian States, and France.

#### OVERCROWDED CONDITIONS DEMAND RESTRICTION.

The commission found in all of the seats of the basic industries, where labor was so overcrowded, that the men as a rule were living on from \$9 to \$15 a month, \$15 a month being the maximum amount expended and \$9 the minimum. The conditions under which they were living are described in the commission's report, as follows:

The living conditions of southern and eastern Europeans and the members of their household is shown in the detailed studies of the various industries, the most significant indication of congestion and unsatisfactory living arrangements being the low rent payments each month per capita. The recent immigrant males being usually single, or, if married, having left their wives abroad, have been able to adopt in large measure a group instead of a family living arrangement, and thereby to reduce their cost of living to a point far below that of the American or older immigrant in the same industry or the same level of occupations. The method of living usually followed is that commonly known as the "boarding-boss system." Under this arrangement a married immigrant or his wife, or a single man, constitutes the head of the household, which, in addition to the family of the head, will usually be made up of 2 to 20 boarders or lodgers. Each lodger pays the boarding boss a fixed sum, ordinarily from \$2 to \$3 per month, for lodging, cooking, and washing, the food being usually bought by the boarding boss and its cost shared equally by the individual members of the group. Another common arrangement is for each member of the household to purchase his own food and have it cooked separately. Under this general method of living, however, which prevails among the greater proportion of the immigrant households, the entire outlay for necessary living expenses of each adult member ranges from \$9 to \$15 each month. The additional expenditures of the recent immigrant wage earners have been small. Every effort has been made to save as much as possible. The life interest and activity of the average wage earner from southern and eastern Europe has seemed to revolve principally about three points: (1) To earn the largest possible amount of immediate earnings under existing conditions of work; (2) to live upon the basis of minimum cheapness; and (3) to save as much as possible. The ordinary comforts of life as insisted upon by the average American have been subordinated to the desire to reduce the cost of living to its lowest level.

Among these classes the usual avenues through which aliens come in touch with American life are largely lacking. Eighty-six per cent of the married men were living single lives, having left their wives in Europe, so that in these communities children were very few in number. Everyone who has studied the subject knows that in the work of assimilating our foreign population the public schools are the greatest of agencies in bringing them into touch with American life. Why? Because just as soon as the child of an alien enters the public schools he stands upon an equality with the native-born child; there is a perfect democracy in the public schools. They become acquainted, one with another; they join in sports;

they visit the homes of others. You have seen it, and I have seen it. Through the agency of children the foreign family comes in touch with the American family, and the American housewife gets interested first in the alien children and then in the alien housewife. In that way the foreigners are brought under American influences; in touch with community and family life. They are made to feel that they are welcome, and they gradually develop into American citizens. But under the conditions described by the commission the men were found to be so many labor units, leading isolated lives, unable to come in touch with and caring nothing for American institutions, either National or State or municipal. It is an undesirable class to have in any thickly populated city, unless work is so plentiful that they can have constant employment, because when work is not plentiful and they are driven to the hardship which comes from poverty they become a dangerous element—not because they are bad men by nature but because they are ignorant of our institutions and are living isolated lives. They know and care little about us. To them American life and American institutions are sealed books. In prosperity they are industrious, quiet, and law-abiding; but in adversity they are suspicious, and when an agitator appeals to them, particularly if he be of foreign birth, they are the tinder to which he applies his torch, and they are the element that can be fanned into the flame that results oftentimes in riot, as was the case at Lawrence, Mass., only three years ago. They are a danger to society when living under such conditions.

I can not conceive of anything more dangerous in a thickly populated city than vast volumes of people of alien birth, the product of alien civilization, many of them unable to speak the English language, who never come in contact with American thought or American sentiment, who are not actuated by any of the impulses of American citizenship, and who are here simply to gain a livelihood which they can not get at home.

It may be interesting for the Senate to consider for a moment that in the city of New York there is a population of between four and five millions—about 4,700,000—and that only 19.3 per cent of that entire number have native-born fathers and mothers, 38.2 per cent are either of foreign or mixed parentage, and 40.4 per cent were actually born abroad. They are largely of the new immigration, right enough in regard to race, right enough in regard to purposes, composed of men who are willing to work, who are frugal in their habits; but, of course, they are common laborers; and if industries are threatened and depression comes that is the element from which we must expect more danger than from any other.

What I have said of New York can be said of Chicago. Only 20.4 per cent of the population of that city have native-born parents, while 41.8 per cent are either of foreign or mixed parentage, and 35.7 per cent were actually born abroad.

I select a town in New England—Lawrence—where that terrible and most deplorable strike occurred two or three years ago. It is a city with a population in round numbers of 85,000. Only 13.6 per cent of that population have native-born parents. Thirty-seven and nine-tenths per cent are of foreign or mixed parentage and 48.1 per cent—almost half of the population of the manufacturing city of Lawrence—were actually born abroad. What occurred there is known to all the world. In that overcrowded body of newly arrived aliens the Industrial Workers of the World found the material they desired, and in 24 hours had so succeeded in inflaming its passions that masses marched upon mills in which they had no interest with the purpose by force to stop their operation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Yes.

Mr. REED. Why did those people in Lawrence strike? Was it not for better wages?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. They struck for better wages, and they also struck because they could not get steady employment, as they were there in such large numbers.

Mr. REED. Well, they struck for better wages.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. And they struck because agitators incited them to strike.

Mr. REED. They struck for better wages, and they struck at a time, at least, when they were encouraged by other people who came in. Was not the leader who came in and agitated this strike an American-born citizen?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. If the Senator knows, I wish he would state it, because I do not know whether he was or not.

Mr. REED. I think he was; that is my understanding. I supposed the Senator could answer the question.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Now, I wish to ask the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield further, and to whom?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I had yielded to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will not interrupt the Senator from Missouri now.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask now if it is not true that acts of violence by strikers have been engaged in by American citizens just as they have been engaged in by foreign-born citizens? I call the attention of the Senator to the great railroad strike of a few years ago, when the whole commerce of our Nation was arrested, and I ask the Senator if the great majority of those railroad men were not only American citizens, but were they not also good citizens?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not know to which of the strike leaders the Senator from Missouri alludes. I do not know whether or not Mr. Ettor is an American citizen by birth, but it has been stated over and over again that Mr. Giovannetti, who was one of the leaders of that strike, is not only not an American citizen, but that at that time he was a candidate for office in Italy. I do not know that that is a fact, but it has been stated to me by people who say that they know it to be a fact.

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, this matter ought to be settled upon the right and wrong of it, and not upon any isolated case or upon impression. My understanding is that the head of the Industrial Workers of the World is an American citizen. If I am wrong in that, I should like to be corrected. My understanding further than that is that the majority of those who struck in the West Virginia mines recently were native-born American citizens. My understanding is that in the great railway strike of a few years ago the vast majority were American citizens. My understanding is that strikes are not confined to foreigners and that violence is not confined to foreign-born people; and I undertake to say that the figures will show that they have been more patient, more long-suffering, and less likely to rise in violence than our own native-born American citizens; and I can demonstrate that absolutely.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I hope the Senator did not understand my argument to be what his remarks would indicate. The point I was making was not that these are undesirable races, not that they are undesirable as individuals, but that when they come in such vast numbers as to compete against themselves and to live under the conditions I have described, where they are overcrowded, where they are without employment, they become then, under those conditions, an especially dangerous element in our society.

Mr. President, having shown that in these overcrowded communities of the industrial States the aliens constituting them are of the classes that I have indicated, largely males leading single lives, common or unskilled laborers in the main, a large proportion of them without steady employment, all of them living under conditions most undesirable, and a considerable percentage of them coming from nations where elementary education is sadly neglected, it is apparent that the Immigration Commission were wise when they recommended the reading test as the one most feasible method of meeting the situation. That is the point I wish to emphasize to the Senate, because in this discussion the merits of the literacy test and the purposes hoped to be accomplished through its inauguration have been discussed and considered upon every other ground than the true one.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want to be led afield from the matter that is now pending before the Senate. The question we are discussing is within very small bounds. It is this, Shall an immigrant who can pass the moral test, the physical test, and the financial test be denied admission solely because he is unable to read and write, even though he can affirmatively show that he has been driven from his own country by persecution on account of his race?

The committee has reported a bill exempting from the literacy test those who are fleeing to escape religious persecution and those who are fleeing to escape political persecution. The sole question we are now discussing is whether we shall enlarge the literacy exemptions so as to also include within them those who are fleeing to escape racial persecution. It is not proposed a single man can come in because of racial persecution if he be morally or physically unclean. It is not proposed



that he shall be admitted here unless he can pass every single test save the one test of literacy.

So far as I am concerned, I am unwilling to deny a human being who is fleeing from persecution the right of asylum and drive him back to the arms of his tormentors simply because he is uneducated. At the same time I do not believe we ought to permit those races of men who are incapable of amalgamating themselves with the American people to ordinarily settle within our borders. I recognize the fact that there are certain races of men who can not become American citizens as we understand that term, and who can not be brought to an understanding of our governmental conditions or our social life. They are of a different blood. They have different habits of thought. Our civilization from the home life to governmental methods is in antagonism with their very natures. Hence, if they were to become a part of the body politic, they would not only be foreign to it when they joined it, but they and their children and their children's children would remain foreign.

The oriental is in a class by himself. His instincts, mental processes, aspirations, passions, and philosophy are all fundamentally different from ours. I am willing to join the committee in excluding by name all such races of men; but the question we are discussing is not that question. This bill proceeds upon the assumption that it is right to admit emigrants from all foreign countries save China. It proposes to exclude certain individuals who can not pass particular tests. Now, the question is whether some of those races whom we admit it is proper to allow to emigrate to this country, whom we admit will be entitled to residence and to citizenship here if they can read, shall be excluded because they can not read if they have come to this country to escape racial persecution. That is the whole question now before the Senate.

I shall discuss that special question a little later on. Just now I deem it pertinent to call attention to the real purpose back of this bill. That purpose is to limit foreign immigration of every kind. I have not the slightest doubt that the responsible authors of this bill, if they thought it possible so to do, would have here a bill prohibiting all immigration into the United States. They seek to escape from that broad position, and yet in a measure accomplish their end, by declaiming against recent immigration. They do not dare stand before the American people on the old know-nothing platform, which has been a byword now for nearly half a century, and declare that this country of America is for Americans. They do not dare condemn the German citizen and his sons, the Irishman and his children, the Englishman, the Scotchman, and the Welshman. These nationalities are strong in this country. The political party that undertook to condemn them would find itself relegated to privacy at the next election. Not only would these foreign-born people and their sons vote against such a proposition and such a party, but broad-minded, native-born American citizens would join in the condemnation.

I took occasion several days ago, I think on the 10th of December, to discuss this question of who are foreigners and who are Americans. When, if you please, does one get to be an American citizen? I listened to the marvelous array of figures presented here by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] in which, in order to demonstrate that there was a very large proportion of foreign population engaged in certain industries, he added to the foreign-born citizens those who were the children of foreign-born citizens. That kind of juggling with figures does not impress me.

When do you get to be an American citizen, anyway? If a boy whose parents or one of whose parents was born in Europe, but who was himself born upon this soil, and who is entitled to all the rights and privileges of an American citizen, is not entitled in this discussion to be regarded as an American citizen, then will his son in turn be an American citizen? How many generations must one's parents have lived in this country in order that he may be entitled to call himself an American?

When I hear this cry against foreigners I wonder if we or our ancestors were not all once foreigners. Whence did we come? If the Senator from Vermont can trace his ancestry back—and I know not how far he can—through a long line of individuals who happened to be born upon this soil, is he thereby any better citizen than the man who finds that his parents were born in Europe and he himself was born here? Or is that individual any better than the man born in Europe?

What constitutes an American citizen? Is it the number of generations your people have been here? If so, if you set the number at more than one generation, you would exclude many Members of this body; you would exclude many Members of the House of Representatives; you would exclude from your list poets, orators, statesmen, artists, physicians, lawyers, ministers, musicians, merchants, manufacturers, historians, who have

contributed to the glory of our Nation. You would exclude them by the thousands and tens of thousands—those who have helped establish our industrial primacy.

What constitutes the length of pedigree you must have before you can be said to be "standard bred"? When are you standard bred? Must you be able to show that no ancestor back to the third generation has been guilty of the crime of being born under a foreign sky, or must it be five or six or seven generations, or shall it be but one? When are you entitled to wear the royal purple? And then, when you trace your ancestry back to five or six or seven generations, is it necessary that you shall find that your ancestors came from a certain country and measured up to certain conditions? If you apply that test, how many shall be entitled to be regarded as really blue blooded?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, this is a question of most vital importance, and it seems to me we should have a quorum. I raise the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON). The Senator from New Jersey suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Page	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Hollis	Perkins	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Hughes	Pittman	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Jones	Pomerene	Smoot
Clapp	Kern	Ransdell	Swanson
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Reed	Thomas
Culberson	Lane	Robinson	Thornton
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Root	Vardaman
Dillingham	Lewis	Saulsbury	White
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	Williams
Gallinger	Nelson	Sheppard	
Gore	Newlands	Shields	
Gronna	Overman	Simmons	

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I again announce regarding the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] that he is absent from the Senate on public business. He is paired with the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was asking the question how long a man's pedigree had to be in this country in order to entitle him to call himself an American citizen. Then I suggested that if we went back to the time when his ancestors came to this country, we might find that they came under the same difficulties, had the same vile habits, and were of the same low order of intellect that it is now charged afflict the present-day immigrant.

I wonder if some of these American aristocrats, if they were to go back far enough, might not find that some one of their remote grandmothers was sold upon the auction block and paid for in long green tobacco? In those days, when we had the "old immigration," now so highly praised by the authors of this bill, European nations dumped their prison hordes upon these shores. Shipowners carried over indentured servants here and sold them into practical slavery. I wonder how many of the modern aristocrats, who curl their lips in fine scorn at the poor fellow who now seeks asylum, could trace their ancestry back to that kind of an immigrant?

When in this Chamber I hear these people who flee from persecution in other lands denounced as vicious and bad because they are unlettered I can not forget that when some of our early immigrants, now so much lauded, landed upon these shores they came with instruments of torture in one hand and the Bible in the other and sought to find in the words of Holy Writ a warrant for religious persecution. I have in mind the fact that some of these old immigrants whom we now so much do eulogize and love drove Roger Williams into the wilderness, and that upon the hills of Massachusetts they lighted the flames that drank up the blood of poor old women being executed for the imaginary crime of witchcraft. I recall to mind that some of this original immigration and parent stock was willing with fagot and sword to exterminate an entire colony because its inhabitants worshiped God under a cross that now points toward the sky from every hamlet and village of our land.

We are told that the ancient immigration was all good, that it was a most noble class of noble men and women, and yet, sir, this cry that is made in the Senate in the closing days of the year of our Lord 1914 has been upon the lips of the prescriptionist from the days when our Republic was born. The same charge that is being made to-day against certain classes of foreigners has been made against every class of foreigners. I can duplicate every condition of horror that has been adverted to to-day by the utterances of those who stood opposed to foreign immigration in the early days of this Republic. I can cite you to illustrious examples and to words that fell

from the lips of great men, who were sincere then as these even greater men of the present are sincere.

It is just a part of human nature, that is all. Everybody thinks he is an ornament to the State; that what he does is right. Likewise he thinks his family is better than his neighbors. For the same reason he regards the people of his community as better than the people of other communities. He has no difficulty in convincing himself that the people of his State are better than the people of any other State; he considers it an act of treason not to insist that the people of his country are better than the people of all other countries, and so reasoning from the standpoint of his own egotism and his own ignorance, he elevates himself to a pinnacle of glory, and he condemns all who are not of his country, kith, and kin to a position of ignominy. Accordingly he translates the sentence "The world is the Lord's and the fullness thereof" into "the world is mine," and asserts the right to deprive others of a home upon God's footstool.

That, sir, is the creed of ignorance. It is the doctrine of proscription and hate. It is the philosophy of the Pharisee who wraps the mantle of his holiness about him and "thanks God he is not as other men." It is as old as human selfishness. It was born in cruelty. It has been nurtured in the lap of superstition. It has carried the torch and the thumbscrew and the rack into many lands. It has made this world to run red with blood. It has lighted the night of fear with the flames of martyrdom. It has no more place in America than has a wild beast of the jungle in the crowded street of a city. It is the voice of the fourteenth century echoing through the corridors of the twentieth century. It is the ugly visage of hate and scorn and malice leering through wicked eyes into the faces of the oppressed. It is nothing new.

The argument you make, sir, that the old immigration was good and that the new immigration is bad is a mere subterfuge and avoidance of the question. What you really want to do is to deprive the oppressed of other lands of a refuge in this land of freedom.

I said a moment ago that the same cry was raised against every race of men that ever landed on our soil, and I am about to prove it. It was raised against the Irish, the Germans, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Welshmen, the Englishmen, the Scotchmen—all races of men. Somebody got here first, and then in his egotism, in his smallness, in his narrowness, he said, "I will keep all others out. Here God spread out the immeasurable forest; here He made the level plains; here He set the streams to flowing in majestic beauty; here He spread the flowers over the face of the land. I got here first, and nobody else shall come. I came here in rags and tatters and poverty; I came here in rebellion against the Government where I was born; I came here to worship God according to the dictates of my own conscience and make everybody else do the same thing and kill them if they would not; and now that I am here I say to those who are yonder, 'My clothing is now better than yours, my home is now better than yours. Continue in your rags and poverty and strain the eager eyes of hope and desire toward this land that God made for you the same as for me, but you shall stay where you are, always and forever to dwell in the hopeless night of tyranny and despair.'"

Thus have the exclusionists always sought to write the laws. At the same time we send missionaries and Bibles to the people we drive from our shores. We are willing to lead them to salvation, but we refuse them a place whereon to lay their heads. The doctrine of proscription ought never to be on the tongue of an American citizen.

But I return to call the attention of those who do me the compliment of listening to the proof I propose to advance that the old immigrant was no better regarded than the present immigrant; I exclude, of course, the undesirable races referred to in the early part of my remarks. The old immigrant was inveighed against as is the new immigrant. The country was warned of the awful fate impending if it permitted them to land. And now a word or two upon that. Senators will find it, I think, somewhat interesting to see how thoroughly narrow we have always been, and yet these narrow utterances have always been repudiated by the American people.

I warn Democratic Senators that if we pass a bill that is proscriptive, that is built on any other than the broad principle that we will admit to this country all people capable of becoming good citizens here, you will find that bill a millstone around the neck of the Democratic Party.

Returning, however, to my promised demonstration that the early immigrant was in his day and generation inveighed against as bitterly as is the present-day immigrant, I call your attention to a somewhat startling quotation. I read you a contemporaneous dissertation on the ancient immigrant, whom you now

describe as "the good immigrant, the man who carried in his veins the royal blood that specially fitted him to become a great American citizen," the man you now credit with having built our railroads, erected our temples of worship, constructed our mighty cities, and otherwise done so much for our great country. Here is the contemporary dissertation I want to read on him, and then I will tell you its author and you will see that ignorance can not be charged to this man, and that he must have voiced a sentiment quite universal in his day among his class. The statement was made May 9, 1753. Its author was speaking of the Germans who had come to settle in Pennsylvania—ah, the sturdy Germans that we now say because they came from the north of Europe are the exact kind of people to make good citizens of. Speaking of them he said:

Those who come hither are generally the most stupid of their own nation.

That is what these gentlemen are saying now about the recent immigrants:

Those who come hither are generally the most stupid of their own nation, and as ignorance is often attended with great credulity, when knavery would mislead it \* \* \* It is almost impossible to remove any prejudice they may entertain. \* \* \* Not being used to liberty, they know not how to make modest use of it. \* \* \* I remember when they modestly declined intermeddling with our elections; but now they come in droves and carry all before them, except in one or two counties.

Few of their children know English. They import only books from Germany, and of the six printing houses in the Province two are entirely German, two half German half English, and but two are entirely English. They have one German newspaper and one half German. Advertisements intended to be general are now printed in Dutch and English. The signs in our streets (Philadelphia) have inscriptions in both languages and some places only in German. They begin of late to make all their bonds and other legal instruments in their own language, which (though I think it ought not to be) are allowed in our courts, where the German business so increases that there is continued need of interpreters, and I suppose in a few years they will also be necessary in the assembly, to tell one half of our legislators what the other half says. In short, unless the stream of importation could be turned from this to other colonies, as you very judiciously propose, they will soon outnumber us, that all the advantages we will have will, in my opinion, be not able to preserve our language, and even our Government will become precarious.

That is what was said of the Germans in 1753, on the 9th day of May, by Benjamin Franklin. How far Franklin was mistaken! That narrow view of a great people is undoubtedly the greatest mistake of that great man's life. People were narrower then than they are now or than they have been until very recently. That is what Franklin thought of the sturdy Germanic people who were then coming to this country.

But what did these immigrants do? They made the land to blossom as the rose. They brought with them their religion; they erected schoolhouses and temples of worship; they gathered their families about them, and from their veins flowed that stream of blood the committee declares gave added strength and vigor to the American commonwealth.

If Benjamin Franklin lived to-day, I have no doubt what his position would be. He was capable of learning, and he would have frankly acknowledged his mistake.

But, sir, it is a fact that the Germans did come in such numbers that the apprehension became in part true. Franklin feared that the proceedings of the Legislature of Pennsylvania would have to be conducted in the German language, and it is a fact that from July 15 to September 28 the legislature ordered its minutes printed in both the German and English tongues, and that that practice was continued as late as 1790.

But did Pennsylvania become a German Province? What part of this country has more steadfastly stood for the dignity and greatness of our land than has Pennsylvania at every period of her history?

I pass from the Germans and from this comment upon them to another class of immigrants. Mr. Walker, who has written much on immigration questions, has this to say of the early immigrant, "the good immigrant," "the desirable immigrant," the immigrant whom the committee would have us believe was not at all like these poor fellows of to-day.

The great majority of immigrants to this country were so poor that they could not buy their passage, and in order to meet the obligations incurred by them for passage money and other advances they were sold, after their arrival, into temporary servitude.

Is there anything like that going on to-day? There was something a little like it when we had the contract-labor laws that were put on the books at the instigation of New England, for which section the Senator from Vermont so eloquently speaks. I read on:

The prepayment of the passage was the exception, and its subsequent discharge by compulsory labor the rule. The shipowners and ship merchants derived enormous profits from the sale of bodies of immigrants, as they charged very high rates for the passage, to which they added a heavy percentage—often more than a hundred per cent—for their risks. But the immigrants suffered bitterly from this traffic in human flesh. Old people, widows, and cripples would not sell well,



while healthy parents with healthy children and young people of both sexes always found a ready market.

These are doubtless the progenitors of some of the aristocrats of to-day.

If the parents were too old to work, their children had to serve so much longer to make up the difference. When one or both parents died on the voyage, their children had to serve for them. The expenses of the whole family were summed up and charged upon the survivor or survivors. Adults had to serve from 3 to 6 years; children from 10 to 15 years, till they became of age; smaller children were, without charge, surrendered to masters, who had to raise and board them. As all servants signed indentures, they were called "indentured servants." Whenever a vessel arrived at Philadelphia or New York its passengers were offered at public sale. The ship was the market place, and the servants were struck off to the highest bidder. The country people either came themselves or sent agents or friends to procure what they wanted, be it a girl, or a "likely" boy, or an old housekeeper, or a whole family. Parents sold their children in order to remain free themselves. When a young man or girl had an opportunity to get married they had to pay their master £5 or £6 for each year they had to serve. Yet a steerage passage never cost more than £10. \* \* \* If the master did not want to keep his servant, he could sell him for the unexpired time of his term of servitude.

And you stand here advocating this bill, denouncing the poor fellow who comes to the country now, and must come with money in his pocket and without any contract and must pass a physical examination before he can enter and can show that he is morally clean. You stand here and denounce him and pronounce a eulogy and an encomium upon the ancient immigrant who came here in bonds and legal chains. How many of the aristocrats of to-day can trace their ancestry back to that illustrious period?

But, sir, I do not pause at this. Are there any here who have Irish blood in their veins? If I looked around this room I would see many; and who is there of them will for a moment deny his race? Those of us who have some Irish blood in our veins believe that it is the blood of a great race that was greatly wronged; a race that once the shackles were broken and it was given a fair chance in the contests of life demonstrated to all the world that in everything that makes for manhood and womanhood it can hold its place well at the head of the column of human progress and achievement.

As to the Irish, here is what Mr. Walker said about them when they were migrating, and I shall show you a little later on that the newspapers of that day said the same thing, for the American citizen of that day who believed in "America for Americans" joined in the cry. All the cries sound to me like the snarling of gray wolves mingled with the yelping of coyotes around the sheepfold of humanity.

Said Walker:

The conditions under which they (the Irish) had been born and brought up were generally of the most squalid and degrading character. Their wretched hovels, thatched with rotting straw, scantily furnished with light, hardly ventilated at all, frequently with no floor but the clay on which they were built, were crowded beyond the bounds of comfort, health, or, as it would seem to us, of simple social decency; their beds were heaps of straw or rags; their food consisted mainly of buttermilk and potatoes, often of the worst, and commonly inadequate in amount; their clothing was scanty and shabby.

Are any class of immigrants coming here now who are worse off than that? Why were these Irish poor? Ah, that is the question. Why are these immigrants coming now poor? That is the question. Is it the result of slothfulness, of indolence, of vice, of inherent disposition to be of the lazzarone, or is it because oppression's iron hand has closed the door of opportunity in their faces? If it be the former, exclude them; but if it be the latter, then in the name of the God of humanity do not deny them entrance to a land of hope.

Why was Ireland poor? Her mills had been closed by the decree of a conqueror. Her people had been crushed to the earth by those who took the lands away from their fathers. Her schools that once had flourished and had shed the light of intelligence throughout Europe had their windows barred. Her sons were hunted like wild beasts, and for sport. Cromwell soldiers had marched across the land bearing upon their bloody pikes the heads of slaughtered babes of Ireland. And so at last the Irish were made poor. They were driven into hovels. They did sleep upon rotten straw; it was the best they could get. They lived like animals, because they could not live like men. Yet through it all they clung to their religion and their wives and their children. But when they came to this country, sir, when they entered the land of opportunity, what did they do? Ah, they lived humbly here a while. They probably crowded into tenements, and they crowded many of them into a single room. They got work at any price they could obtain.

Their shovels and pickaxes were soon busy building railroads across the continent; they were glad to get the work; they lived in shanties. We used to call them "shanty Irish." Many of them could not read or write, but they had in their hearts glowing the flame of manhood; they had in their souls the

courage to get on and to fight on in the world. After awhile the section hand became the section foreman, the section foreman became the superintendent of construction, and the superintendent of construction became the president of the railroad. After awhile the little, ragged urchin who played in the mud of the Irish shanty made his way in school; after awhile we heard of him at the bar, where the wonders of his eloquence thrilled and enthralled all who heard him; after awhile we saw him in the Halls of Congress; after awhile we heard his wonderful music upon the platform; after awhile we learned that the blossoms of beauty in the cheeks of the Irish girls had won the love of the American aristocrat's sons, and that, when Irish and native American bloods were united in the veins of their children, a stronger race had been produced. Now the Irish are respectable, and they are pointed to by this committee as illustrious examples of a desirable immigration.

In the good old days there were committees and newspapers to warn the people against the Irish, as there are those now to warn us against the present-day immigrant. On May 2, 1846, they had a strike of Irishmen. Behold these good Irish had struck as did the wicked people at Lawrence, Mass.

The same danger loomed big in the horizon then that now obscures the vision of my friend from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. The New York Weekly Times on May 2, 1846, discussed the strike of Irish laborers in Brooklyn and said their earnings were barely sufficient to pay the rent of a decent tenement, so they were allowed to build miserable shanties on ground allotted them by the contractor on the plot occupied by them in performing the work.

A quarter of a century later—this brings us down now to a period after the war—these people were charged with living in "sickening kennels." That will be found in the report of the Massachusetts bureau of labor and statistics for 1869 and 1870, at page 80.

Here is a report by a city inspector in 1864. Speaking of the Irish, he says:

The tenants seem to wholly disregard personal cleanliness, if not the very first principles of decency, their general appearance and actions corresponding with their wretched abodes. This indifference to personal and domestic cleanliness is doubtless acquired from a long familiarity with the loathsome surroundings, wholly at variance with all moral or social improvements.

That is found in the report of the industrial commission at page 456.

Now, my friends, just for the sake of variety, let me call your attention to the fact that the Germans were no better than the Irish, according to the opinions of the people of those days. Here is another report on the foreign sections of New York City, made in 1878:

In many quarters of the city family life and the feeling of home are almost unknown—

How much that sounds like the dissertation of the Senator from Vermont, who a few moments ago complained that there were a lot of people who came here and left their wives behind because they did not have money enough to bring them; he complained that they did not have the feelings of home and he complained of how they lived together in great numbers in small quarters. Let me read this all again:

In many quarters of the city family life and the feeling of home are almost unknown; people live in great caravanseries, which are hot and stifling in summer, disagreeable in winter, and where children associate together in the worst way. In many rooms privacy and purity are unattainable, and young girls grow up accustomed to immodesty from their earliest years. Boys herd together in gangs and learn the practices of crime and vice before they are out of childhood. Even the laborers' families who occupy separate rooms in these buildings have no sense of home.

Dr. Griscom as early as 1842 had called attention to the "depraved effects which such modes of life exert upon the moral feelings and habits," and the city inspector in 1851 remarks that "these overpopulated houses are generally, if not always, seminaries of filthiness, indelicacy, and lawlessness."

That was made to apply to both the Irish and the Germans. Surely there is no new thing under the sun. The old serpent of proscription has had its habitat in every country. In every age it has crawled forth to thrust its forked tongue into the faces of the hopeless and the despairing. Here is something more about the Irish. The Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor in New York in 1859 reported that the Irish immigrant "had an utter distaste for felling forests and turning up the prairies for themselves. They preferred to stay where another race would furnish them with food, clothing, and labor, and hence were mostly found loitering on the lines of the public works in villages and in the worst portions of the large cities, where they competed with negroes for the most degraded employments."

Why, that is what you are saying now about the present-day immigrant, just as a few years ago you were charging that the Irish herded in the cities, that the Germans herded in the

cities, that the Swedes herded in the cities, and that all these wicked foreigners herded in the cities. It was charged then just as truthfully as it is charged now. It is perhaps true that the Irish and Germans herded in the cities for a short time, but you now admit that they ultimately went to the farm, to the towns of the interior, where they and their descendants are found by the million.

Let us argue this question fairly. The same cry is upon your lips to-day that was upon the lips of the proscriptionists in 1859. That which you breathe out now against the immigrant who comes to our shores was then being uttered against the immigrant from Great Britain and the north of Europe, who you now say is an ornament to our society and a strength to our Republic. The whole mistake lies in this, that then, as now, the poor creature from an oppressed land who had lived under the iron rule of despotism, who had been denied opportunity, and who came here half starved and half naked, was estimated according to his condition when he arrived instead of estimating him according to his condition after he has had opportunity to benefit himself.

Mr. President, I could read at much greater length of the Irish and the Germans. I pass on, however, to show that the same cry has been raised against other races. In 1885 the New York Bureau of Immigration Statistics held a long hearing, just as this committee has had some hearings, and just as this commission we have heard about had hearings. They summed up their observations—they were speaking of the immigrants from northern Europe, the Danes and the Swedes—and they said of them that they "interfere very much with the keeping up of the wages in the trade," and that, therefore, they were an undesirable people. Whoever desires to follow that subject can read the Sixteenth Annual Report of the New York Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1898 and find the comment on page 1047.

So we find protest against Danes, against Swedes, against Irish, against Germans, against Dutch, and a general protest against all immigration, at least against German immigration, from Benjamin Franklin himself.

One of the principal arguments of the Know-nothing Party against foreign immigration, and particularly against Irish immigration, was that the Irish were a criminal race. The Know-nothing Party asserted that 1 out of every 154 Irishmen was a criminal, and hence they argued as follows—I am reading from Mr. Hourwich's very illuminating work:

One of the favorite arguments against immigration since the days of the Know-nothings has been the assertion that "the foreigner, in proportion to his numbers, furnishes by far the greater part of crime." In the middle of the nineteenth century the Irish immigrant was the object of popular odium as one one hundred and fifty-fourth of a criminal.

That was the charge.

The newspapers and pamphlets of that time published statistics which showed that, although the foreign population was only an eighth of the whole, yet it furnished \* \* \* 1,000 more criminals than all the remaining seven-eighths of the people.

And they asserted that—

Every 154 of them produced a criminal.

Of course those statistics were inaccurate; of course they could not be sustained; but it was the charge of the day; it was the attitude of the time; it was the cry then, as we have the cry now, against the people who come from impoverished lands seeking an opportunity and home here.

Mr. President, what is the reason for these views that have always been expressed with reference to immigrants to this country? A little sober analysis will afford the reason and a little fairness ought to give a correct answer. The wealthy, the opulent, the happily situated in other lands remain where they are. We do not migrate from this land to Europe because our condition here is better than it would be in Europe. If conditions in America were to become worse than they are in Europe, there would be a migration from this country to Europe; but who would migrate? It would not be those who hold good offices; it would not be those who own the banks and the railroads; it would not be those who have good salaries; it would be that class of our people who found their condition most intolerable and who were seeking to better that condition.

That same rule has obtained at every period of history with reference to immigration from Europe, if we make the possible exception of those periods when there were considerable numbers fleeing to this country purely for conscience's sake and for religious liberty. There were, of course, in the very early days a few adventurous spirits who came here to establish themselves in principalities, to obtain enormous land grants, and so forth. I except them from the rule; but with these small exceptions—and they are so small as not to affect the grand total—the people who have come to this country in every age of our devel-

opment have been those who in their own land were for the most part unhappily situated.

They came here because there were better wages; they came here because they were impoverished in their own land; and consequently when in the early days they migrated they indentured or mortgaged themselves—their bodies and almost their very souls—for passage across the ocean.

They came here from Ireland because the oppressor's heel was on the land and because poverty had cast its ghastly pall over the Green Isle until the Irish people were lined along the lanes almost in windrows of dead, rotting in the sun. They came here from other countries under similar conditions. Of course when they came they were poor, indescribably and unutterably poor. They did not look well. They had not had sufficient food for their bodies or enough clothing for their backs. That was true of most of them. There were others who came, of course, in somewhat better condition, but nearly all of them were poor, nearly all of them were fleeing oppression or fleeing poverty; all of them were coming here to better their condition; but when they came under those circumstances they often did not look well.

The American aristocrat turned up his nose and he said, "What a horrid-looking lot of horrid people are coming to this blessed land of ours." And yet his own ancestors only a few years back had come in the same or in a worse condition. The test is not how an immigrant looks when he comes here, but how he behaves when he gets here and what he develops into after he has been here a reasonable time.

So that, looking at these people as they come and as they exist the first few years after they are here, everyone can make a bad report and tell the truth. Uncharitable tongues have always been busy with evil prophecies; so it was spoken of the Irish and Germans. But after they had been here a while, when they had risen to respectability and power, we were told, and are now told, "that class of immigrants is all right." The Irishman is respectable now. Why? He has made his traducers respect him. The German is respectable now. Why? Because he has so built himself in this country that none dare traduce him.

The Swede, also, has become respectable, and he has come here at a later period; and the Norwegian, also, is respectable; yet I can remember when certain people were greatly alarmed lest the Swede would injure our country. But how long was it until these Swedes and Norwegians had made the prairies of Minnesota and of Dakota to blossom? How long was it until they had demonstrated to the people of this country that they were bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh, and that, measured by any standard of manhood or civilization, they were entitled to their place along with the best?

Mr. President, I heard an argument made here this afternoon that we ought to exclude the Austrian. Pray, who are the Austrians? Is the Austrian not of as good blood as the German? Is he not as strong in body? Is he not as moral in life? Is he not of the white race? Is he not brave upon the field of battle? Is he not patriotic? Does he not obey the law? Does he not love wife and children? Does he not erect homes? Does he not build temples of art? Does he not bow to the same God you worship? Has he not given to history thousands of illustrious names?

Prejudice is a veil that, drawn before the eyes of man, distorts his vision. He sees the fairest forms distorted into diabolic shapes; he beholds the evil countenance of Satan transformed into the visage of an angel. Prejudice is the narrowest thing in all this world; it is the meanest thing in human nature; it is at once the parent and the child of ignorance; it has done more to withhold the march of human progress than all other human imperfections.

I heard here some sneering remarks aimed at the Servians; and yet that little people, poor but gallant, brave almost beyond belief, are at this hour standing within the natural fortresses of their hills and dying for their homes, their wives, their children, and their liberty as courageously as ever stood the soldiers of the Revolution with Washington in the days when our country sought to throw off the oppressor.

I hear read these statistics showing that there are many illiterates among the Belgians, and I find the fine-grained, delicate sensibilities of some American citizens are tremendously disturbed at the ignorance of the Belgians. Ah, my fellow Senators, that argument does not sound as well to the ears of people to-day as it would have 22 weeks ago, for now we see that people—men, women, and children—rallying in defense of the fatherland they love. We see every boy capable of bearing arms standing on the red line and dying for his country and his home. We behold them charging into the roaring mouths of cannon, and in the grip of death cheering for that liberty



for which they yield their lives. What man is there now to say that the Belgian people are incapable of becoming good American citizens?

If the Senator who has introduced this bill could introduce a million Belgians into his State, in 50 years of time its wealth would quadruple and its swamps and its morasses and its forests would be turned into gardens that would be equal in beauty to the gardens that his ancestors and his people have already planted. If a time ever came when it was necessary to defend this flag and this country, would God we had a million of the sons of Belgium to touch elbow with the sons of Ireland and the sons of England and of France and America in defense of the home of human liberty!

Why, about all the leaders of the world's dominant thought have done for a thousand years has been to teach people to hate each other. The Englishman stood and looked across the little narrow channel and denounced the Frenchman. The Frenchman hated the Englishman. Both of them scorned the German. The German in turn gave back their contempt in good measure. So prejudice was built up, and nations were taught to distrust and despise each other. They could give each other credit for nothing. After a while that iron bond of prejudice made these countries provincial and caused them to retrograde. If you want to find a progressive country you go to one that has opened its doors generously. If you want to find a country that is rotting and dying, search for one that has proscribed other peoples.

China rose to a position of greatness marvelous beyond our present knowledge, I doubt not. Her literature was the most wondrous in the world, her cities the most beautiful, her people the most cultured. She taught, before the days of Christ, the principles of the Golden Rule. Her philosophers produced thoughts of such beauty that they are read to-day and counted as among the choicest jewels in the casket of human knowledge. But China walled herself in. She denied her ports to other peoples. She concluded to live by herself and for herself; and so, save as she atrophied and died, she sat unchanging and unchanged while the procession of human progress marched on and the world left her behind.

Japan closed her ports and declared herself to be superior to other nations. She excluded foreigners. She would have neither foreign blood nor foreign learning, until she sank to a condition where a half dozen little vessels could enter her ports, humble her, and compel her to open her doors to the commerce of the world. Let me say to you that when Japan awoke, she awoke because those doors had been battered down with cannon. She began to find out that there were superior races and nations, at least in power, to her. She began sending her young men to the universities of the world. She began to invite trade and commerce and settlement; and suddenly there ran through her veins a new life, and Japan rose, a giant, from the bed in which she had slumbered for centuries.

India closed her doors. She sank into an intellectual torpor. She stretched herself upon a couch of death. Still she sleeps on. Turkey excluded foreigners, and beheld the "unspeakable Turk," who lives as lived his ancestors of 3,000 years ago, save this, that all their glory is departed and all their genius has expired.

What nations have flourished? It has been those nations that have opened their doors and that have reached out their hands to gain knowledge from other countries. It is those nations that have had an admixture of blood that have led the van of human progress.

Why, sirs, if you were to ask me to point you to the great primal cause that has brought about the civilization of this day I would say that it was due to the fact that from the forests of Germany there swept out a tidal wave of emigration so powerful that it could not be stopped by proscription or by the mandate or armies of a king. It poured on in a resistless flood and transformed ancient Gaul into France. Another stream overran ancient Brittany and transformed it into England. Another stream from Norway and Sweden and Denmark broke against the shores of England and of France; there the Norsemen established themselves, built cities, and mixed their blood with the parent blood of the conquered peoples, and from that united stream there came a stronger race of men.

If you were to ask me to point you further, I would say that Germany's first great step toward dominance and world power was taken when Frederick the Great invited the learned men of every land to come to Prussia, when he raked the world almost with a fine-toothed comb for its genius, when he said to the artisans of Europe and all other countries, "Come hither! Here awaits you an opportunity to develop your genius and to help upbuild this State." It was because of that, more than because of his genius in war, that Frederick the Great was

able to lay the foundations of the Prussian Kingdom, which became ultimately the nucleus of the German Empire.

England for centuries has led the van of human progress. England's doors have been swinging open for centuries. Her laws have been more generous than those of the countries which surrounded her. France has stood in the very forefront, and France has generously welcomed the foreigner. But turn to Spain, if you will, and if you ask when Spain took her first fatal step, I answer you, when she drove the Jews from her borders.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. CLAPP. In connection with that same thought, France at one time closed her doors against the Jews, and became so desolate in her distress that she opened them again, and from that time on came her progress.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. I was going to mention that, but I thank the Senator for his contribution. France and all of these countries at one time drove out some of their own peoples. The Huguenots were expelled, and when France expelled the Huguenots she cast out the best part of her genius and her courage and suffered for it for centuries afterwards.

Proscription has never made any nation great. The nations that have reached out, gathered in the surrounding people, adopted them into themselves, seized upon their superior qualities, and made them their own are the nations that have always prospered in this world.

Now, let me for a moment review our own history. Ah, let us be frank! There are those of us so proud of this country that we have almost convinced ourselves that God created a peculiar race especially that it might come here and populate this land; that all the women were queens of beauty and paragons of virtue, and all the men were lordly knights, gallant chieftains, to whose proud veins we trace our illustrious lineage. But what are the facts? I have already adverted to them, but briefly.

First, the adventurer; but when the adventurer came he brought with him many of the humble class, the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. Then came some who were persecuted for their religion. Then came some fleeing from political persecution; but then came the great mass which makes up the body of the ancient American people, if I may use that term. They were the starvelings of Europe. They were the impoverished. Many came, as I have shown you, as indentured servants. They sold their bodies for their passage. They came here in ignorance, in poverty, in rags, in superstition; but they came here in response to one sentiment which, if it dwell in a human heart, will transform that human being into a man and a citizen. That was the love of liberty, the hatred of oppression, the determination, at whatsoever cost, to achieve liberty. And so they sold their bodies into chains temporarily, to the end that they and their children might walk on free soil, gaze with free eyes upon a free sky, and enjoy the blessings of liberty.

Whenever you find in a race of people a willingness to sacrifice so much to gain freedom, you need not fear them. Aye, they are the people who will most carefully guard liberty. Think you, sir, that the Irish, who came here from their impoverished land, who all their lives had seen English landlords skimming the cream from the land, who saw their sons dragged to jail, their women mistreated, their industries ruined, their families crowded into tenants' hovels with thatched, rotten roofs—think you that when they came to this country and found a government that gave equality of opportunity to all they would not love that government with a fervor that could not for a moment thrill the heart of a man who had not been thus oppressed? Do you think, sir, that if a hundred thousand Belgians were to land upon our coast next year there would be, in the hundred thousand, a single man who would want to see this government transformed into a military autocracy? Nay. On the other hand, he would join every patriot here to protest against it. Think you, if he saw a foreign monarch with his fleets of war entering our ports, this man, who had felt the oppressor's heel, who had clanked the oppressor's chains, would not be the first to offer his life in defense of liberty? The whole question is, Have the people coming here the quality of progress? Have they love of liberty?

In the opening days of this new century, at the close of the greatest century of the world's progress, we are asked to change our policies; and why? Always our doors have stood open. These poor people have come here from other lands and have accepted the office of the hewer of wood and the drawer of water. They have lived humbly. They have lived in poverty,

They have lived as best they could live until the hard conditions of life could be ameliorated. Always the proscriptionist has stood and warned us that these people would sink the ship of State, that they would destroy our Government, that they would ruin our population; but always, in everincreasing hordes, they have come, more and still more of them, and as our population has increased they have increased in numbers.

What is the result? Have our farms depreciated in value? Why, sirs, the little narrow strip of settlements upon the eastern coast have been extended to the Pacific. The desert has been rescued from the grip of drought and turned into splendid farms. We have expanded until we are 90,000,000 of people, and proudly say these 90,000,000 of people are the best people on earth. I am in accord with that sentiment. Who are they? They are the offspring of these immigrants.

Who built these railroads? Have we been slow in our progress? Who erected our mighty cities? Have we been backward in that? Who has put up the walls of these schools and seminaries? Have we been behind the world in that?

Why, my fellow citizens, the marvel and miracle of all the ages is the progress of America. We have gone forward, step by step—aye, we have gone forward by bounds. In two centuries of time we have builded the greatest Nation the sun has looked upon since first it kissed the horizon of creation. Is there anything in that history to make us fearful?

The Jew has come. Has he ruined us? Are we afraid of the Jew? The Irishman came. Did he ruin us? Are we afraid of the Irish? Why, if this country were in danger to-day, do you fear what the Irish citizen would do, whether born here or born yonder? Have the Germans ruined us? Have not the combined energies of all these races of men united in one gigantic forward movement that has pushed the car of progress, in a hundred years of time, a greater distance than it traveled since Adam was created? In all the intervening time it did not go so far.

Is our race dwindling physically? I think not, sir. I think, man for man, we are better than the other races of the earth. Have we dwindled mentally? I think not, sir. I think, man for man, we are keener, shrewder, and superior to the other races of the earth; and yet I do not think we know it all, nor that we can not learn from others.

Has this country been ruined? I affirm that if we had set up a policy of proscription on the 4th day of July, 1776, we would probably have been reconquered by England in 1812. I affirm that we would have been a weak and puny nation; that our civilization probably would not yet have reached the western borders of Ohio; that in all likelihood some foreign country would have established itself in all the western two-thirds of the United States; and that we, instead of being the greatest Nation of the earth, would have been among the weakest, even if we were at all able to maintain our independence.

#### RECESS—HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I move that not later than 6 o'clock to-day the Senate shall take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it the idea of the Senator to begin the daily sessions at 11 o'clock hereafter?

Mr. KERN. No; simply for to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 15 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m., Tuesday, December 29, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 30, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 29, 1914.*

##### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER.

Henry Clay Hall, of Colorado Springs, Colo., to be an interstate commerce commissioner for a term of seven years from January 1, 1915. (A reappointment.)

##### JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT.

Charles E. Bunnell, of Valdez, Alaska, to be judge of the district court of the District of Alaska, division No. 4, vice Frederick E. Fuller, resigned.

#### UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Martin F. Farry, of Wilmington, Del., to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware, vice George L. Townsend, removed.

#### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1914:

Marion C. Robertson,  
Ernest L. Gunther, and  
Henry T. Settle.

William V. Fox, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 18th day of December, 1914.

Maj. Thomas C. Treadwell to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps (subject to examination required by law) from the 27th day of September, 1914.

Maj. Dion Williams to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps (subject to examination required by law) from the 10th day of November, 1914.

Capt. Reynold T. Hall, an additional number in grade, to be a rear admiral in the Navy from the 12th day of December, 1914.

Ensign Edmund S. R. Brandt to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1914.

The following-named warrant officers of the Navy to be ensigns in the Navy from the 30th day of July, 1914:

Machinist Morris J. Lenney and  
Machinist John D. Edwards.

Capt. John F. McGill to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 27th day of September, 1914.

First Lieut. Harold F. Wirgman to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 27th day of September, 1914.

Second Lieut. Frederick R. Hoyt to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 27th day of September, 1914.

#### RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Raymundo Harrison, of Anton Chico, N. Mex., to be receiver of public moneys at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., vice Enrique H. Salazar, deceased.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ALASKA.

Mary A. Carroll to be postmaster at Treadwell, Alaska, in place of Elna Olson, resigned.

##### IOWA.

Earl Bronson to be postmaster at Spencer, Iowa, in place of Charles C. Bender. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1914.

##### SOUTH CAROLINA.

Martha E. Nichols to be postmaster at Yorkville, S. C., in place of Maggie M. Moore. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1914.

##### TEXAS.

J. L. Sandel to be postmaster at Saratoga, Tex., in place of E. B. Hill. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1914.

##### VIRGINIA.

C. F. Ratliff to be postmaster at Floyd, Va., in place of James H. Sumpter, resigned.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 29, 1914.*

##### CONSULS.

Milton B. Kirk to be consul at Orillia, Ontario, Canada.  
Thomas D. Bowman to be consul at Fernie, British Columbia, Canada.

José de Olivares to be consul at Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.  
James H. Goodier to be consul at Niagara Falls, Ontario, Canada.

John Fowler to be consul at Rimouski, Quebec, Canada.

Nelson T. Johnson to be consul at Chungking, China.

John Q. Wood to be consul at Chemnitz, Germany.

Carl F. Deichman to be consul at Bombay, India.

##### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Henry P. Andrews to be register of the land office at Sacramento, Cal.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ARKANSAS.

I. N. Deadrick, Parkin.  
Linn Turley, Forrest City.

##### COLORADO.

Andrew V. Sharpe, Fruita.



## KANSAS.

Wenslow Cipra, Lincoln.  
 Clarence Coulter, Blue Rapids.  
 Frank H. Higley, Cawker City.  
 Jeremiah M. Hopper, Ness City.  
 Lloyd E. Jackson, McPherson.  
 Allen W. Jones, Minneola.  
 Joseph J. Keraus, Wakeney.  
 R. D. McCliman, Seneca.  
 Louis C. Orr, Atchison.  
 S. T. Osterhold, Holton.  
 Nathan E. Reece, Stafford.  
 Thomas J. Ryan, St. Marys.  
 Henry F. Schmidt, Dodge City.  
 John Wolfert, Downs.

## MISSOURI.

William S. Dray, Savannah.

## NEBRASKA.

Frederick A. Mellberg, Newman Grove.

## NEW YORK.

William J. Ferrick, Chappaqua.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Carl L. George, Sarles.  
 A. A. J. Lang, Sanborn.  
 Myrtle Nelson, Bowman.  
 W. W. Smith, Valley City.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Demetrious S. Billington, Spearfish.

## TEXAS.

Sallie M. Ayres, Frankston.  
 Samuel H. Bell, Deport.  
 Edwin Forrest, jr., Blum.  
 Edmund Herder, Shiner.  
 E. G. Keese, Stamford.  
 C. T. McConnico, Kerens.  
 Bessie L. Rorex, Panhandle.  
 Martha A. Smith, Pleasanton.

## VERMONT.

George W. Pierce, Lyndonville.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Charles Lively, Weston.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, December 29, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we thank Thee that Thou hast spared our lives and permitted us to enjoy another Christmas, with its hallowed associations, sacred memories, and holy influences, which strengthens the ties of friendship, deepens the affections, and brings us nearer to Thee and our fellow men. Grant, O most merciful Father, that the Christ spirit may abide with us and lead us on to greater attainments in the work Thou hast given us to do. We thank Thee that peace abides within our borders; continue, we beseech Thee, our peaceful relations with all the world. And glory and honor and praise be Thine forever, in the spirit of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 23, 1914, was read and approved.

## PEACE RESOLUTIONS, SALEM QUARTERLY MEETING OF FRIENDS.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have read from the Clerk's desk a memorial in the interest of peace by the Salem Quarterly Meeting of Friends, at Woodbury, N. J., December 10, 1914.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] asks unanimous consent to have read from the Clerk's desk the paper to which he has referred. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Speaker and House of Representatives, United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The Salem Quarterly Meeting of Friends (with a membership of about 1,000) were earnestly engaged on the subject of peace during its sessions at Woodbury, N. J., December 10, 1914.

We wish to commend our President and United States Congress for your successful effort in maintaining peace with other nations and wish to assure our continued support in maintaining this attitude both in Mexico and in Europe.

We also wish to offer our protest against the increase of armament, war vessels, and greater fortresses in preparation for war. The present fortifications along our 4,000 miles of seacoast have been sufficient for the last 100 years. We therefore most earnestly urge our Congress to refuse the consideration of any measure tending toward war, not only because we, a Christian body, believe war is wrong, but we are opposed to adding greater burdens of taxation upon our people by creating and maintaining such warlike defenses as is now proposed.

If the United States can maintain its position of neutrality until the end of this European war, we trust that it will be able to exert a decisive influence for the establishing a plan for the settlement hereafter of all international differences, without resorting to war.

On behalf of Salem quarterly meeting.

CHAS. D. LIPPINCOTT, Clerk.

SWEDSBORO, N. J., December 10, 1914.

## ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 20347) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 1250), which was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

## RURAL CREDITS.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a speech made by J. P. Doyle, a farmer living in Illinois, on the subject of rural credits and some problems of the farmer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by one of his constituents, a Mr. Doyle, on the subject of rural-bank credits. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Reserving the right to object, has the gentleman read the paper?

Mr. FOSTER. I have.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman think the information is of value to the membership of the House?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think so, and it is an expression of a farmer who is interested in the matter of rural credits and has studied the question, and that class of people are directly affected by legislation that I hope will come before Congress at an early date.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will not object to this request, but I think it ought not to be taken as a precedent that every farmer who has an opinion can extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOSTER. There are some of us who represent large agricultural districts who believe that the farmers have a right to be heard on the floor of this House and to give expression to views which they may have on subjects that directly affect them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am always glad to hear from the farmers on this floor through their accredited representatives. That does not mean that every farmer has a right to speak, however.

Mr. FOSTER. I take pleasure in presenting the views of such men as Mr. Doyle and other men who work upon the farm, and the farmers are the large producers of wealth in this country and entitled to be heard.

Mr. BRYAN. The gentleman should remember that the leader of the Democratic Party on this floor promised the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] and the gentleman from Oklahoma that in all probability there would be a bill brought out before Congress for action if they called off their filibuster. They called it off, and the gentleman has not been able to bring it up. Has the gentleman from Illinois any inside information that they will be able to bring in such a bill, despite the opposition referred to?

Mr. FOSTER. "The gentleman from Illinois" has no inside information. He is only an humble Member on the floor of this House, representing a large constituency of farmers, but he does believe before this present administration ends and before Mr. Wilson is reelected President of the United States—

Mr. MANN. That will run till the end of time.

Mr. FOSTER. Or another Democrat is elected President of the United States, which will be in 1916, and another Democratic Congress is elected in 1916, if not at this session, there will be legislation upon this particular subject that will be satisfactory to the farmers of the country, and I am sure every effort will be made in the House and among Democratic leaders to enact such legislation as will give to the farmers of this country that which was not given them during the long term of your party in the House and in complete control of the Government.

Mr. MANN. They were all prosperous then.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask my friend from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] whether this is intended as an explanation of, or an apology for, the fact that the Democrats do not intend to enact such legislation?